

DAVIS POLK & WARDWELL LLP  
450 Lexington Avenue  
New York, New York 10017  
Telephone: (212) 450-4000  
Facsimile: (212) 701-5800  
Marshall S. Huebner  
Benjamin S. Kaminetzky  
James I. McClammy  
Marc J. Tobak  
Gerard X. McCarthy

*Counsel to the Debtors  
and Debtors in Possession*

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

**In re:**

**PURDUE PHARMA L.P., et al.,  
Debtors.<sup>1</sup>**

**Chapter 11**

**Case No. 19-23649 (RDD)  
(Jointly Administered)**

**NOTICE OF FILING OF MONITOR'S REPORT**

**PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that Purdue Pharma L.P. hereby files on behalf of Thomas J. Vilsack, in his capacity as Monitor, the *Initial Monitor Report* attached as Exhibit A hereto. Mr. Vilsack, as Monitor, prepared the *Initial Monitor Report* pursuant to the Voluntary Injunction entered as part of the *Second Amended Order Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 105(a) Granting Motion for a Preliminary Injunction*, entered on November 6, 2019 (the "**Preliminary**

---

<sup>1</sup> The Debtors in these cases, along with the last four digits of each Debtor's registration number in the applicable jurisdiction, are as follows: Purdue Pharma L.P. (7484), Purdue Pharma Inc. (7486), Purdue Transdermal Technologies L.P. (1868), Purdue Pharma Manufacturing L.P. (3821), Purdue Pharmaceuticals L.P. (0034), Imbrium Therapeutics L.P. (8810), Adlon Therapeutics L.P. (6745), Greenfield BioVentures L.P. (6150), Seven Seas Hill Corp. (4591), Ophir Green Corp. (4594), Purdue Pharma of Puerto Rico (3925), Avrio Health L.P. (4140), Purdue Pharmaceutical Products L.P. (3902), Purdue Neuroscience Company (4712), Nayatt Cove Lifescience Inc. (7805), Button Land L.P. (7502), Rhodes Associates L.P. (N/A), Paul Land Inc. (7425), Quidnick Land L.P. (7584), Rhodes Pharmaceuticals L.P. (6166), Rhodes Technologies (7143), UDF LP (0495), SVC Pharma LP (5717) and SVC Pharma Inc. (4014). The Debtors' corporate headquarters is located at One Stamford Forum, 201 Tresser Boulevard, Stamford, CT 06901.

**Injunction Order**”),<sup>2</sup> which requires that the Debtors retain a Monitor, and that the Monitor file a report no less than every 90 days regarding compliance by the Company with the terms of the Voluntary Injunction (the “**Monitor’s Report**”). Purdue Pharma L.P. is filing the Initial Monitor’s Report as a courtesy to the Monitor, who has not retained counsel in connection with these chapter 11 cases.

**PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE** that a copy of the Monitor’s Report and any related papers may be obtained free of charge by visiting the website of Prime Clerk LLC at <https://restructuring.primeclerk.com/purduepharma>. You may also obtain copies of any pleadings by visiting the Court’s website at <https://www.nysb.uscourts.gov> in accordance with the procedures and fees set forth therein.

Dated: May 20, 2020  
New York, New York

*/s/ Marc J. Tobak*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
DAVIS POLK & WARDWELL LLP  
450 Lexington Avenue  
New York, New York 10017  
Telephone: (212) 450-4000  
Facsimile: (212) 701-5800  
Marshall S. Huebner  
Benjamin S. Kaminetzky  
James I. McClammy  
Marc J. Tobak  
Gerard X. McCarthy

*Counsel to the Debtors  
and Debtors in Possession*

---

<sup>2</sup> Unless otherwise defined herein, each capitalized term shall have the meaning ascribed to such term in the Preliminary Injunction Order.

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

**In re:**

**PURDUE PHARMA L.P., et al.,  
  
Debtor.<sup>1</sup>**

**Chapter 11**

**Case No. 19-23649 (RDD)**

**(Jointly Administered)**

**INITIAL MONITOR REPORT**

Comes now, Thomas J. Vilsack, as duly contracted Monitor for Purdue Pharma L.P. to report to the Court as follows:

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This Initial Monitor Report will include an outline of actions taken to date to determine compliance with the terms and conditions of the Voluntary Injunction, a general description of the documents and records reviewed, and a set of recommendations provided to Purdue Pharma L.P. and the company's responses thereto. Officials at Purdue Pharma L.P. have been responsive and cooperative by providing documents in a timely and complete fashion and by arranging for multiple interviews with key officials and providing more than 9,000 pages of documentation at my request. Based on what has been reviewed to date and subject to the recommendations contained herein Purdue Pharma and the Initial Covered Sackler Persons appear to be making a good faith effort to comply with the terms and conditions of the Voluntary Injunction.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Debtors in these cases, along with the last four digits of each Debtor's registration number in the applicable jurisdiction, are as follows: Purdue Pharma L.P. (7484), Purdue Pharma Inc. (7486), Purdue Transdermal Technologies L.P. (1868), Purdue Pharma Manufacturing L.P. (3821), Purdue Pharmaceuticals L.P. (0034), Imbrium Therapeutics L.P. (8810), Adlon Therapeutics L.P. (6745), Greenfield BioVentures L.P. (6150), Seven Seas Hill Corp. (4591), Ophir Green Corp. (4594), Purdue Pharma of Puerto Rico (3925), Avrio Health L.P. (4140), Purdue Pharmaceutical Products L.P. (3902), Purdue Neuroscience Company (4712), Nayatt Cove Lifescience Inc. (7805), Button Land L.P. (7502), Rhodes Associates L.P. (N/A), Paul Land Inc. (7425), Quidnick Land L.P. (7584), Rhodes Pharmaceuticals L.P. (6166), Rhodes Technologies (7143), UDF L.P. (0495), SVC Pharma L.P. (5717) and SVC Pharma Inc. (4014). The Debtors' corporate headquarters is located at One Stamford Forum, 201 Tresser Boulevard, Stamford, CT 06901.

## INJUNCTION

1. On November 6, 2019, the Bankruptcy Court entered a Preliminary Injunction order as part of the above entitled bankruptcy case. The Preliminary Injunction order included, as Appendix I, a Voluntary Injunction (Injunction) pursuant to which Purdue Pharma L.P., on its behalf and on behalf of its direct and indirect subsidiaries and general partner (collectively “Purdue Pharma”), agreed, in part, to retain a Monitor with the responsibility to report on compliance with the terms of the Injunction every 90 days. The Preliminary Injunction has been amended several times, but the Voluntary Injunction has remained the same each time. A copy of the currently operative Preliminary Injunction order, entered by the Bankruptcy Court on April 14, 2020, including the Injunction is attached hereto and made a part hereof as Exhibit One.

2. Under Part II Section A paragraph 1 a-h of the Injunction Purdue Pharma agreed to restrict the dissemination of information by Purdue Pharma or a Third Party on its behalf that was either likely or intended to influence prescribing practices of health care providers (HCPs) in favor of prescribing greater amounts, quantities, doses and/or strengths opioid products.

3. Under Part II Section B paragraph 1 of the Injunction Purdue Pharma agreed not to provide any financial incentive to its sales and marketing employees or take any disciplinary action against any of its sales and marketing employees that was directly based on or tied to the sales volume or quotas for opioid products unless otherwise permitted by the above entitled Bankruptcy Court.

4. Under Part II Section B paragraph 2 of the Injunction Purdue Pharma also agreed not to offer to pay any remuneration directly or through a Third Party to any person or entity for

the prescribing, sale, use, or distribution of opioid products other than the use of rebates or chargebacks.

5. Under Part II Section C paragraph 1 and 6 of the Injunction Purdue Pharma agreed not to provide any financial support or In-Kind support to any Third Party, medical society, or patient advocate group for the purpose of promoting opioid or opioid products including but not limited to the following: providing links to Third Party websites related to opioids or opioid products, knowingly using a Third Party to engage in activity prohibited by the Injunction, enabling or advocating for the appointment of a director, board member, employee, agent, or officer to serve in a similar capacity concurrently in any entity that promotes opioids, opioid products or opioid related treatment of pain or opioid related side effects except as authorized under the Part II Section C paragraphs 1 and 7 of the Injunction.

6. Under Part II Section D paragraph 1 of the Injunction Purdue Pharma agreed not directly or through a Third Party lobby for the enactment of any federal, state, or local legislation or for the promulgation of any rule or regulation that encourages or requires a health care provider to use opioids or sanctions a health care provider for the failure to prescribe or use opioids for the treatment of pain subject only to the limitations set forth in Part II paragraph D (4) of the Injunction.

7. Under Part II Section D paragraph 2 Purdue Pharma agreed not to directly or through a Third Party lobby against the enactment of any federal, state or local legislation or against the promulgation of any rule or regulation encouraging non-pharmacological or non-opioid pharmacologic therapy for the treatment of pain, the use of lowest possible dosages where appropriate of opioids or immediate release opioids, a limitation on an initial prescription of an opioid product, reasonable preconditions including testing before prescribing an opioid product,

the use of or payment for evidence based treatments for opioid use disorder, and the implementation of a proper disposal system subject only to the limitations set forth in Part II Section D paragraph 4 of the Injunction.

8. Under Part II Section D paragraph 3 of the Injunction Purdue Pharma agreed not to directly or through a Third Party lobby against the enactment of any federal, state or local legislation or against the promulgation of any rule or regulation that would limit the operation or use of PDMPs (Prescription Monitoring Program) including any requirement mandating the use of same before prescribing any opioid or opioid product.

9. Under Part II Section E of the Injunction Purdue Pharma agreed to abide by whatever decision is made by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) on the pending Citizens Petition dated September 1, 2017 concerning a ban on high doses of prescription and transmucosal opioids exceeding 90 morphine milligram equivalents.

10. Under Part II Section F paragraph 1 of the Injunction Purdue Pharma agreed it would not directly or through a Third Party promote a savings card, voucher, coupons, or rebates programs to any health care provider for any opioid product or provide financial support to a Third Party to circumvent any such restriction. However, Purdue Pharma is authorized to provide savings cards, vouchers, coupons or rebate programs, including point-of-dispense programs, in response to requests or on its website under the Injunction.

11. Under Part II Section G paragraph 1 a-d of the Injunction Purdue Pharma agreed to operate an effective monitoring and reporting system to detect suspicious orders and possible diversion of opioids and opioid products by a direct customer or identify whether a downstream customer poses a material risk of diversion.

12. Under Part II Section G paragraph 2 of the Injunction Purdue Pharma agreed to promptly provide reasonable assistance to law enforcement agencies involved in investigations of potential diversions or suspicious circumstances involving Purdue Pharma opioid products.

13. Under Part II Section G paragraph 3 of the Injunction Purdue Pharma agreed that when and if one or more of the three largest pharmaceutical distributors establishes a system to aggregate transaction data involving the sale of opioid products and/or reports of suspicious orders Purdue Pharma would provide information into that system to the extent available and feasible, provided that the system is designed to use information provided by manufacturers of opioid products.

14. Under Part II Section G paragraph 4 of the Injunction Purdue Pharma agreed to refrain from acting as a distributor of opioid product (aside from rescue and treatment medications) directly to a retail pharmacy or health care provider that would require it to be registered as a distributor under the Controlled Substances Act unless otherwise required by local, state, or federal law.

15. Under Part II Section I of the Injunction members of the Sackler family as identified and described in Part I Section K, as Initial Covered Sackler Person, agreed not to be actively engaged in the opioid business in the United States other than by virtue of their ownership interest in Purdue Pharma and that they would individually or collectively take no action interfere with the Purdue Pharma's responsibilities and duties under the Injunction.

#### **MONITOR AGREEMENT**

16. On February 13, 2020 the undersigned and Purdue Pharma executed the Purdue Monitoring Agreement, attached hereto and made part hereof as Exhibit Two and began

immediately to take steps to comply with the monitor responsibilities as outlined in Part II Section H paragraphs 1-5 of the Injunction.

17. After the execution of the Monitoring Agreement in person or telephonic interviews were conducted of the following individuals whose titles were: Purdue Pharma President and CEO, Purdue Pharma Senior V.P., General Counsel and Corporate Secretary, Purdue Pharma Associate General Counsel, Purdue Pharma Chief Financial Officer, Purdue Pharma V.P. Business Operations, Purdue Pharma V.P. Research and Development, Purdue Pharma V.P. Medical Affairs, Purdue Pharma V.P. Chief Compliance Officer, Purdue Pharma V.P. Sales and Marketing, Purdue Pharma V.P. Chief Scientific Officer, Purdue Pharma Associate Director Ethics and Compliance, Purdue Pharma V.P. Federal Government Affairs, Purdue Pharma Executive Director, Head of Government Affairs, Rhodes Pharmaceuticals L.P. President, Rhodes Technologies President, Rhodes Pharmaceuticals L.P., V.P. Sales and Marketing, Rhodes Pharmaceuticals L.P. and Rhodes Technologies V.P., General Counsel, Rhodes Pharmaceuticals L.P. and Rhodes Technologies V.P., Chief Financial Officer, Purdue Pharma Director of Health Policy, Purdue Pharma Head of Market Access, Purdue Pharma Director Pharmacy Distribution Sales.

18. After the execution of the Monitoring Agreement, documents and records, listed in the document attached hereto and made a part hereof as Exhibit Three, were provided at an in person meeting at the corporate headquarters on February 13, 2020 and subsequently reviewed.

19. After the execution of the Monitoring Agreement documents and records, listed in the document attached hereto and made a part hereof as Exhibit Four, were produced on March 4, 2020 and March 8, 2020 and subsequently reviewed.

20. After the execution of the Monitoring Agreement documents and records, listed in the document attached hereto and made a part hereof as Exhibit Five, were produced on March 19, 2020 and March 20, 2020 and subsequently reviewed.

21. After the execution of the Monitoring Agreement documents and records, listed in the document attached hereto and made a part hereof as Exhibit Six, were produced on March 23, 2020 and subsequently reviewed.

22. After the execution of the Monitoring Agreement documents and records listed in the document attached hereto and made a part hereof as Exhibit Seven were produced on April 13, 2020 and subsequently reviewed.

23. After the execution of the Monitoring Agreement documents and records listed in the document attached hereto and made a part hereto as Exhibit Eight were produced on April 20, 21, 29, and 30, 2020 and subsequently reviewed. After the execution of the Monitoring Agreement documents and records listed in the document attached hereto and made a part hereof as Exhibit Nine were produced on May 11, 2020 and subsequently reviewed.

24. After the execution of the Monitoring Agreement websites and social media sites for Purdue Pharma and its related entities were examined and subsequently reviewed relating to opioids and opioid products including: PurduePharma.com, RhodesPharma.com, RxPatrol.com, Butrans.com, HysinglaER.com, Oxycontin.com, AskPurdueMedical.com, Purdue Twitter, and Purdue LinkedIn.

25. After the execution of the Monitoring Agreement websites and social media sites were examined for Purdue Pharma and its related entities relating to non-opioid products and non opioid related activities including: ImbriumThera.com, AdlonTherapeutics.com, AvrioHealth.com, GreenFieldsVentures.com, SlowMag.com, ColaceCapsules.com, Senokot.com,

KiwiBalance.com, Betadine.com, FirstAidMyths.com, AdhansiaXR.com, Aptensioxr.com, Colace Instagram, Betadine Instagram, Senokot Instagram, Senokot YouTube, Colace YouTube, Imbrium Twitter, Adlon Twitter, Imbrium LinkedIn, Adlon LinkedIn and Greenfield LinkedIn.

26. After the execution of the Monitoring Agreement websites, newsletters, magazines and journals for the American Pharmacists Association, American Society of Health System Pharmacists, America Pharmacist and National Community Pharmacy Association were reviewed.

27. After the execution of the Monitoring Agreement the following journals and publications were examined: Pharmacy Today, Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences and Pharmacy Library.

28. After the execution of the Monitoring Agreement websites for McKesson Corp., AmerisourceBergen, Cardinal Health System, CuraScript Specialty Distribution, Morris and Dickerson, JM Smith, Rochester Drug Cooperative, NACDS, and Express Scripts were reviewed.

29. After the execution of the Monitoring Agreement outreach was conducted with the Unsecured Creditor Committee, Non Consenting States Group, and Consenting States Group.

30. After the execution of the Monitoring Agreement a letter from Senator Hassan to the FDA and response to concerns from Purdue Pharma and its related entities was reviewed.

31. After the execution of the Monitoring Agreement the FDA website and comments contained therein relating to the activity of the Joint Meeting of the Anesthetic and Analgesic Drug Products Advisory Committee Product and Guideline were reviewed.

32. After the execution of the Monitoring Agreement outreach was conducted to lawyers at Debevoise, Milbank, and Joseph Hage Aaronson as legal representatives of the

Sackler family members as Initial Covered Sackler Persons as defined and discussed in Part I Section K and Part II Section I of the Injunction requesting certification of compliance with the terms and conditions of the Injunction applicable to the Initial Covered Sackler Family Persons.

33. After the execution of the Monitoring Agreement requests for additional information, clarifications of documents received, and identification of additional people to interview were made pursuant to emails sent to Purdue Pharma Associate General Counsel on February 17, 2020, on March 3,4,13,19 and 23, 2020, on April 7, 13, 15, 20, and 30 and on May 1, 2020.

### **PROMOTION PROHIBITED**

34. Under the Injunction Part II Section A Purdue Pharma and its related entities are generally prohibited from promoting opioids or opioid products and cannot use a sales force to promote opioids and opioid products to health care professionals. In 2018 Purdue Pharma terminated its opioid and opioid products sales force.

35. During the period from December 2019 to the present Purdue Pharma used and continues to use a third-party contract sales force consisting of approximately 90 people for the purpose of promoting its non-opioid product, Adhansia XR®, which is authorized under the terms and conditions of the Injunction. The sales force has received enhanced Adhansia training regarding how to address questions unrelated to the product. If an Adhansia sales representative is asked a question about opioids, he or she must not answer the question posed, and instead must refer the query to Purdue's Medical Affairs Department.

36. During the period from December 2019 to the present Purdue Pharma has had and continues to have in-house and field based Market Access and Trade and Distribution teams that work with managed care organizations and pharmacy benefit managers in order to ensure

formulary coverage, as well as with wholesale customers to ensure that pharmacies maintain adequate supplies of branded opioid products are available to fill prescriptions being properly prescribed by health care providers.

37. For branded opioid products Purdue Pharma's Trade and Distribution team negotiates agreements with most of its wholesalers to distribute opioid products from their central distribution centers for products produced in the Purdue Pharma manufacturing facilities in North Carolina. More than 90% of the branded opioid products are sold to and distributed by three wholesale distributors.

38. The Trade and Distribution team at Purdue Pharma pays quarterly negotiated fees to its distributors per established agreements for which distributors agree to maintain certain minimum and maximum inventory levels and to provide updated inventory and sales data.

39. The sales data collected from wholesalers is provided through a third-party contractor which is used for multiple purposes including the monitoring of suspicious orders by the Ethics and Compliance department.

40. The fee gets paid quarterly as a credit against what the distributor pays for product. The primary purpose of this arrangement is to stabilize supply so that proper prescriptions get filled without delay. This arrangement does not appear to be designed to promote the use or sale of opioid products. However, during the next 90 days more information will be sought to understand fully all the ways the data is used to ensure that none of the reasons related to encouraging more prescribing or use of opioid products.

41. The Market Access team at Purdue Pharma focuses its efforts, in part, on overseeing the effort with managed care organizations and pharmacy benefit managers. Negotiations with managed care organizations and pharmacy benefit managers center on the

formulary status of the products being sold. Purdue Pharma pays a rebate to maintain the appropriate status as a preferred or non-preferred product for each of its products.

42. The benefit of being on a preferred status level in a formulary is that the co-pay paid by the ultimate customer is less than it would be if the drug were in a non-preferred status.

43. If Purdue Pharma engages in the purchase of data such purchases need to be lawful and at a fair market value to maintain compliance with the terms and conditions of the Injunction.

44. If Purdue Pharma engages in providing rebates, such rebates must be at arm's length and only with written prior approval.

45. Over the next 90 days effort will be made to determine if data purchases and concessions, if any, were made. If so, an examination will be into the reasons and circumstances for the purchases or concessions.

46. More inspection and investigation will be in this area to determine how best to avoid a circumstance where a rebate negotiation crosses a line between a good faith effort on the part of Purdue Pharma to ensure adequate product access as opposed to an unauthorized promotion of opioid products contrary to the terms and conditions of the Injunction.

47. In the training described in Paragraph 35 above the sales force is trained not to answer questions asked about opioid products. The sales force is not trained or authorized to detail opioid products, does not receive compensation based on prescriptions of opioids by HCPs they call on and operates as part of the non-opioid Adlon business of Purdue. They are trained not to answer any questions that cannot be answered with either approved Adhansia XR promotional materials or Adhansia XR's Full Prescribing Information. These questions, including any relating to opioids, should be directed to Purdue Pharma Medical Information.

Purdue structured the Adhansia call list based on existing prescribers of ADHD medications, and not based on health care professionals who have prescribed opioids in the past. However, overlap occurred with 1,338 health care providers.

48. **The recommendation has been made that the third-party sales force personnel involved with those overlapping health care providers execute on a semi-annual basis a certification that they have read the Injunction, have provided a list of any health care provider or customer called upon who may have inquired about opioid or opioid products, and acknowledge that each and every person on the list was only told to direct such inquiries to the Medical Affairs Department of Purdue Pharma. Purdue Pharma has agreed to this recommendation and has reached out to its third-party vendor to implement this recommendation.**

49. Prior to the Injunction going into effect Purdue Pharma and its related entities funded and engaged a third-party to assist with an ongoing post marketing study, required by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA). The study is titled “OxyContin post marketing study #4- *Changes in Fatal and Non-fatal Overdose among Patients Dispensed OxyContin after its Reformulation with Abuse-deterrent Properties – A Healthcare Database Analysis with Linkage to the National Death Index-*” which was required by the FDA as a post-marketing study of the safety of OxyContin®.

50. The study assessed changes in the rates of fatal and non-fatal overdose among people dispensed OxyContin or comparator opioids.

51. As part of that study data was being collected for the purpose of supporting the study.

52. In the normal course of business Purdue Pharma would at this point seek to publish the data in a scientific journal.

53. The study included an estimation of the change in the incidence rates of unintentional fatal or non-fatal overdose (OD) in patients prescribed OxyContin before and after its reformulation in August 2010.

54. The study also assessed changes in rates of overdose for OxyContin vs. individual primary and secondary comparator extended-release (ER) and immediate-release (IR) opioids around the time of OxyContin's reformulation.

**55. A recommendation is that if such data is published in a scientific journal and Purdue Pharma intends to link to the scientific journal on websites controlled by Purdue Pharma that a disclaimer be provided that includes reference to the risks associated with opioids and opioid products and the appropriate warning information contained in package inserts, prescribing information and medication guides. Purdue Pharma has agreed to this recommendation.**

56. On its current corporate website and social media sites Purdue Pharma indicates support for the following: wide dissemination of the medical guidance for patients who are prescribed opioid and opioid products, appropriate disposal for unused opioid products, the need for a patient's consent to be fully informed, the use of electronic prescribing and Prescription Monitoring Programs, the need for prescribers to have demonstrated competency in prescribing, the expanded availability of naloxone and medicated assisted treatment options for misuse, abuse and addiction, and the development of abuse deterrent formulations.

57. All of these representations appear to be in compliance with the terms and conditions of the Injunction. However, the Rhodes Pharmaceutical L.P. (Rhodes) website does not provide direct access to that supportive language.

58. **The recommendation is that the same cautionary language used on the Purdue Pharma website also should be used on the Rhodes website given it sells and distributes three branded opioid products and several generic opioid products. Purdue Pharma has agreed to this recommendation.**

59. On the websites and social media sites identified in Paragraph 24 above Purdue Pharma provides a wide range of information related to opioids and opioid products including the following: key attributes of medications, and any savings plan or other resources for specific medications.

60. On the Purdue Pharma websites and social media site there is language consistent with the product label, prescribing information, medication guidance, and package insert for each medication that outlines the risks of addiction, misuse and abuse, the direction to use non-opioid treatments first unless ineffective, proper disposal methods for unused product, encouragement to use Prescription Drug Monitoring Programs and the importance of prescribers having reviewed the Risk Evaluation and Mitigation Strategy (REMS) training recommendations before prescribing any opioid product.

61. These websites require the viewer to acknowledge the risks, warning, and precautions before allowing the viewer a detailed review of any other information available on the site. Unlike on the sites identified in Paragraph 25 above that promote a specific non-opioid product dedicated to the site, the sites identified in Paragraph 24 contain no language or links to any other information that could be construed as promotional.

62. However, the Purdue Pharma LinkedIn company page site is a site recommended for a change. While introducing the company to the 24,535 followers as of May 12, 2020, of the site reference is made to an employee base of 1,027 which does not reflect the decline in the number of employees since the Bankruptcy Court filing.

63. **A recommendation is made to update with current and accurate information on the Purdue Pharma LinkedIn site. Purdue Pharma has agreed to this recommendation.**

64. At the time of the filing of this Initial 90 Day Report the list of research investments involving opioids and opioid products, if any, for the period after January 1, 2019 to the present date is in draft form. Information on the website and documents provided by Purdue Pharma indicate that the only opioid related research that was funded in 2019 by Purdue Pharma relates either to the current 11 post marketing FDA required efforts that predated the Injunction or research related to a product called nalmeferne which is a hydrochloride injection medication being tested to counteract an opioid overdose.

65. These research efforts would appear to be consistent with and in compliance with the Injunction requirements subject only to the recommendations made in Paragraphs 55 above relating to the publication of any data from research efforts. It is expected that when the 2020 reports are filed a similar conclusion will likely be reached.

66. There are no promotional materials for opioid or opioid products on Purdue Pharma's current website. Rhodes has on its website only a product catalogue that identifies generic and branded opioid products which are available for sale and distribution.

67. Purdue Pharma and its related entities have complied with the requirements of Title 21 Chapter I Subchapter D of the Food and Drug Administration of the Health and Human

Services Department's Rules and Regulations by providing package inserts for all opioid products sold by Purdue Pharma and its related entities. These package inserts contain specific language outlining the numerous risks and hierarchy of risks associated with the use of opioid products.

68. The package inserts used for these products also contain the "Boxed Warning" required by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) that provides warnings, outlines a precaution to take, identifies possible adverse consequences, points out more at-risk populations, and alerts to the possibility of addiction, abuse and misuse.

69. These warnings, precautions, alerts and directions are also fully described in the Full Prescribing Information and Medication Guide that accompanies each product.

70. In the prescribing information there is additional information including the recommendation that anyone prescribing the opioid product complete the Risk Evaluation and Mitigation Strategy (REMS) training.

71. REMS training assures that each prescriber understands what opioids are, the risks associated with the use of opioids, the importance of proper dosage, the activities to avoid with the use of opioid products, the significance of the medication guide for patients, telltale signs of possible misuse and the importance of naloxone availability.

72. The Medication Guide designed for patients to read goes into detail about the warnings and risks associated with opioids and opioid products.

73. Labels for the opioid products also contain language to alert patients and prescribers to risks and the need to review the medication guide.

74. All of these materials and the messages contained therein appear compliant with the ban against promotions in the Injunction.

75. There is no evidence on social media for Purdue Pharma or any of its related entities of any promotion of opioids or opioid products.

76. Recent twitter postings on the Purdue Pharma Website discuss the importance of having naloxone available to save a life if and when an overdose situation arises.

77. On the Perspectives page of the Purdue Pharma website the only items appropriately highlighted are the need for reduced reliance on opioid products and how to handle addiction, misuse or abuse.

78. Based on a review of social media and other media outlets outlined in Paragraphs 24 and 25 above Purdue Pharma does not currently promote the use of opioids or opioid products through the use of traditional or social media advertising, social media optimization techniques or links to other sites promoting opioids or opioid products.

79. The first twenty entries that surface when Purdue Pharma is searched on the internet deal with the Bankruptcy case, the settlement of claims or opioid addiction, misuse or abuse.

80. The filed reports from Purdue Pharma and Rhodes reflecting compliance with the federal Sunshine Act and with state expenditure reports required by Massachusetts, California, Connecticut, Vermont, New York, and Nevada were for expenditures in 2018 and involved payments made in conjunction with OxyContin, Butrans® and Hysingla®. All of these expenses were paid long before the Injunction was in force and effect.

81. In addition, a draft of the 2019 federal Sunshine Act for Purdue Pharma and Rhodes was also provided with the understanding that the reports may change before filing.

82. There were reported expenses on the 2019 reports paid after the effective date of the Injunction related to opioid products; however, those expenses appear to be limited only to the continued work associated with the FDA required post marketing studies.

83. As such those expenses would not constitute promotion of opioid products under the terms and conditions of the Injunction. Request has been made for receipt of these reports on an ongoing basis when they are filed with the respective departments and jurisdictions to ensure compliance continues.

84. Purdue Pharma is not precluded from providing comment or input into the regulatory proceedings of the FDA, but up to the filing of this report officials at Purdue Pharma have not provided any comment on the following matters pending before the FDA: the Meeting of the Anesthetic and Analgesic Drug Products Advisory Committee and the Drug Safety and Risk Management Advisory Committee (Docket Number FDA -2019-N-5611) - involving tramadol, celecoxib, and extended release oral tablet formulation of oxycodone submitted by Intellipharmaeapeutics Corp.; (Docket FDA-2019-N-5552) - new drug application for oxycodogol.

85. Purdue Pharma did provide comment, prior to the Injunction, in the FDA Docket 2017-P 5296 proceeding which is a Citizens' Petition to limit high dosage opioid products. However, Purdue Pharma took no position on the Citizens' Petition but raised questions for the FDA to consider as it proceeds to decide on the merits of the Citizens' Petition.

86. No person or official on behalf of a Purdue Pharma or its related entities has provided comment or input on any of the following items pending at the FDA that might directly or indirectly be considered a promotion of opioids or opioid products: Registration and Registration Fees: Controlled Substance and List 1 Chemical (DEA- 2020-0007-0001 recovering

costs of diversion efforts through fee increases); Proposed Collection; Comment Request; Health Care Providers' Understanding of Opioid Analgesic Abuse Deterrent Formulations (FDA-2019-N-5973-0001 providing information on understanding and perception of abuse deterrent formulations); Medicare and Medicaid Programs: Contract Year 2021 and 2022 Policy and Technical Changes to the Medicare Advantage Program, Medicare Prescription Drug Benefit Program, Medicaid Program, Medicare Cost Plan Program and Programs of All Inclusive Care for the Elderly (CMS-2020-0010-0002 compliance with Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018, the Substance Use -Disorder Prevention that Promotes Opioid Recovery and Treatment for Patients and Communities Act, and 21st Century Cures Act); Request for Information on Vaping Products Associated with Lung Injuries (FDA - 2020-N- 0597-0001 use of vaping products associated with recent lung injuries); Registration Requirements for Narcotic Treatment Programs with Mobile Components (DEA-2020-0005-0001 operation of mobile components to dispense narcotic drugs/detoxification treatments at remote locations); Draft Infection Control Guideline FRN 02.26.2020 (CDC - 2020- 0011-0001 occupational infection prevention and control); Developing a Workplace Supported Recovery Program: A Strategy for Assisting Workers and Employers with the Nation's Opioid and Substance Use Disorder Epidemics; Request for Information (CDC-2020-0025-0001 NIOSH plan to develop research on Workplace Supported Recovery); Distribution of Traceable Opioid Material (TOM) Kits across U.S. Laboratories 2020-04083 (CDC -2020 0025-0001 kit access); and Delta Impact Cooperative Agreement Evaluation Data Collection Instruments 2020-04082. (CDC -2020-0023-0001).

87. During 2019 Purdue Pharma did not have a sales force or marketing team for its branded opioid products so no money was spent on such a sales force or marketing team. Of the entire sales and marketing budget for 2019 only approximately 7% was spent on branded opioid

products. Of that 7% nearly 85% was spent on acquisition of data and the remaining 15% was spent primarily for storing and securing that data.

88. The balance of the sales and marketing budget for the branded opioid products was for website maintenance, postage, data transition and savings card expense. None of these investments appears to be used to promote opioid product sales.

89. Prior to the Bankruptcy proceeding, based on Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA) records OxyContin had a market share of approximately 4% of opioid prescriptions in the United States while today its prescription market share in the United States has declined to approximately 1.3% based on data provided by a third-party vendor.

90. According to financial records covering calendar year 2019 provided by Purdue Pharma sales on OxyContin declined by approximately 20% from sales in 2018 and by nearly 60% from sales in 2015.

91. According to financial records covering calendar year 2019 provided by Purdue Pharma sales of Butrans declined by approximately 45% from sales in 2018 and by nearly 50% from sales in 2017.

92. According to financial records covering calendar year 2019 provided by Purdue Pharma sales of Hysingla declined by approximately 22% from sales in 2018 and by nearly 30% from sales in 2017.

### **BONUS, SALARY AND INCENTIVES**

93. In 2019 bonus and financial incentives for Purdue Pharma was based on a company scorecard identifying three factors to be used to determine, if a bonus should be paid out: value creation (30%), efficiency and process optimization (60%), and people and culture (10%).

94. To the extent the bonuses and financial incentives were based on efficiency and process optimization Purdue Pharma established a process of rewarding staff based on sales of products raising potential compliance concerns under the Injunction Part II Section H.

95. However, for 2020 the scorecard criteria was significantly changed. The basic three factors of value creation, efficiency and process optimization and people and culture remained the same. Purdue's branded business operating profit remains a factor of the innovation and efficiency pillar of the 2020 scorecard.

96. Instead, the company in the future would reward behavior that promoted an entrepreneurial mindset and advanced sales of only non opioid products. As a result the 2020 approach will no longer reward staff based on volume of opioid sales. If implemented as designed the current scorecard will be consistent with the Injunction provisions in Part II Section H.

97. In 2019 the Purdue Pharma had a different compensation model than described in Paragraph 93 above for its Market Access Team. The Market Access Team's Compensation System of Incentives for the 6 employees involved in sales to Managed Care Organizations and Pharmacy Benefit Managers identified two factors to consider in determining staff compensation: individual performance and corporate performance.

98. The individual performance element was based on an individual's performance of the "Top 10 Behaviors Based on Our Values" which do not appear directly related to product sales volumes or profits.

99. The corporate performance element was divided into two elements: corporate performance tied to the annual corporate objectives and product performance of the non-opioid product Adhansia XR.

100. In the documents and information requested no revision appears to have been made to the plan.

101. **If that system and those factors remain in place a recommendation would be to state and clarify that in the corporate performance element neither top-line opioid product sales or volume specifically will be used as a factor in calculating salaries or bonus.**

#### **GRANTS AND IN KIND SUPPORT**

102. Under the Injunction Part II Section C Purdue Pharma and its related entities are prohibited from providing financial support or in kind support, such as grants, to any third party for the purposes of promoting opioid or opioid products.

103. Purdue Pharma is not prevented under the Injunction from supporting efforts to combat opioid misuse, abuse and addiction.

104. For any grant to be made now by Purdue Pharma the process requires a review by a multi-disciplinary committee, including the law department and the Ethics and Compliance department, not connected to the sales and marketing departments. Contributions requested by a customer cannot be approved.

105. From November 26, 2019 to February 22, 2020 Purdue Pharma awarded grants to a variety of programs that involved either treatment or prevention of opioid misuse or abuse. Such grants would appear to be in compliance with Part II Section C of the Injunction.

106. An example of the type of grants recently approved was to EVERFI in 6 states connected to Purdue Pharma and its related entities to help fund training materials and a health and wellness curriculum for K-12 students and teachers.

### **THIRD PARTY PAYMENTS**

107. Under the Injunction Part II Section B Purdue Pharma is prohibited from paying any remuneration directly or through a third party for the promotion of the sale, prescribing, use or distribution of opioids and opioid products.

108. Under the Injunction Part II Section C Purdue Pharma and its related entities are prohibited from offering or paying any remuneration to any third party to promote the prescribing, using, distributing, or selling opioids or opioid products.

109. A review of the state audit reports from California, Connecticut, Nevada, Vermont, and Massachusetts and the Federal Spend Reports for Purdue Pharma for 2018 reflects that no payments that would have violated the Injunction had it been in place in 2018.

110. The records for the first two months of 2019 were also reviewed and are in compliance with the Injunction and applicable Federal law.

### **SAVINGS PROGRAM**

111. Under the Injunction Part II Section F Purdue Pharma is banned from promoting broadly defined prescription savings programs but allowed to have such plans and to respond to inquiries about available plans.

112. A review of company records indicated that Purdue Pharma and its related entities discontinued a savings plan for Butrans opioid products because a generic less expensive product became available.

113. However, through a third-party vendor Purdue Pharma still offers savings plans for its OxyContin and Hysingla products.

114. For both the OxyContin and Hysingla savings plans there are conditions and restrictions that are communicated on the company websites. The savings card information available for both products includes the “boxed warning” required for the products by the FDA. The savings card information available for both products through the company websites makes reference to the package insert, medication guide, and prescribing information for the products that sets forth a variety of warnings concerning the products and limitations on when and for what conditions the products should be used.

115. The savings card information for both products prevents the savings card from being used for customers paying cash or for those patients covered by Medicare or Medicaid programs.

116. The savings card information for OxyContin can only be used once every two weeks and is limited to a \$70 savings and for Hysingla ER the benefits amount to \$170 only after the customer has paid \$25.

117. The offering of only the two savings plans under the current terms and conditions outlined appears to be in compliance with the Injunction.

#### **SUSPICIOUS ORDER MONITORING**

118. Under the Injunction Part II Section G Purdue Pharma and its related entities is required to operate an effective monitoring and reporting system that reasonably analyzes collected direct customer data and available downstream customer data to identify suspicious orders as defined in the Injunction Part I Section Q.

119. The company charged the Ethics and Compliance Department with operating the suspicious order monitoring program and directed the Associate Director of Ethics and

Compliance to lead that effort with backup assistance provided by three additional Purdue employees.

120. The Associate Director of Ethics and Compliance has held this role since March 2019. From 2012 to 2018, she was an Associate Director of the Law Enforcement Liaison and Education program with Purdue Pharma's Corporate Security Department.

121. She is a veteran law enforcement officer having served 15 years in the state of Georgia. Her last post prior to working for Purdue Pharma was as the Principal Agent for the Georgia State Medical Board. She served as the Georgia Chapter President of the National Association of Drug Diversion Investigators (2003-2020).

122. Purdue Pharma has adopted a Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for identifying suspicious orders of existing customers. The SOPs (as well as other non-opioid controlled substances) requires a quarterly review of chargeback data for covered opioids and opioid products, continuous reviews of orders, and a process for additional review when an order or customer is flagged.

123. In addition, as of November 2019 Purdue Pharma required and will require its customers to complete an annual Wholesaler Due Diligence Questionnaire.

124. The questionnaire in part is designed to provide information on the customer's own suspicious order monitoring program. The customer is asked whether its program is homegrown or third-party vendor provided, the extent of any Federal Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA) review of the system, the number of orders reported to the DEA for further investigation, and action taken when an order is found to be suspicious.

125. The questionnaire asks whether a customer uses a Prescription Monitoring Program (PMP) to track patients seeking to fill a prescription at multiple pharmacies or seeking

to obtain prescriptions from multiple providers during a particular period of time. The specifics of Prescription Monitoring Programs vary by state, and state laws and regulations typically limit access to Prescription Monitoring Program data. The questionnaire also asks if customers review information on top prescribers for each customer and verify those prescribers through due diligence.

126. Purdue Pharma's customers and its customers' customers take a variety of approaches in designing their SOMs programs, as reflected in the questionnaire responses. They also deem varying numbers of orders to be suspicious under their suspicious order monitoring programs.

127. A number of Purdue Pharma's customers provided questionnaire responses that were incomplete, unsigned, unresponsive, or lacked accompanying documentation.

128. Examples include the following Wholesale Distributor Questionnaires: one distributor refused initially in its questionnaire to provide any information on its suspicious order monitoring system claiming it was proprietary; one distributor submitted an unsigned questionnaire; one distributor had not had its homegrown system reviewed by the DEA since 2007 based on its submission; one distributor clearly copied its questionnaire from another wholesale distributor raising serious questions about the truthfulness of the responses ; one distributor questionnaire indicated their suspicious order monitoring program was still being worked on and that no further report would be forthcoming until the summer of 2020; one distributor reported it had a "manual" system which had not been reviewed by the DEA; one distributor questionnaire made reference to an attachment explaining their suspicious order monitoring system that was not in fact attached; and one distributor questionnaire suggested it

was a pharmacy and did not need a suspicious order monitoring system. In most of the aforementioned examples no follow up occurred at a Purdue Pharma.

129. The Associate Director of Ethics and Compliance started working for Purdue Pharma and its related entities in 2019 and began a series of visits to some of the wholesale customers.

130. Her visits involve an inspection of security systems on the site and interviews with key staff involved in managing the storage of product and identifying suspicious orders.

131. The notes of these visits reflect discussion of the storage of product, but do not provide documentation or discussion that might have occurred regarding the customers' suspicious order monitoring efforts.

132. None of the visits in 2019 were to facilities of the largest distributors; however, some visits did occur in 2018.

133. The suspicious order monitoring system used at Purdue Pharma and its related entities relies on two factors: (1) an algorithm that identifies orders of unusual size, pattern and/or frequency and (2) manual thresholds that are established for each customer. Either or both these factors can identify an order that requires additional review.

134. The system relies on the use of an algorithm generated by third party vendor. It is based in part on national sales data. It uses a scoring system that takes into consideration a comparison of the order to a series of thresholds involving historic orders from the customer and from the industry. The cumulative score determines if the order is initially flagged.

135. The system seeks to identify orders of unusual size, unusual frequency, or those deviating from normal purchasing patterns which is consistent with DEA guidance.

136. If an order is flagged under the SOP, the order is reviewed and contact is made by email or by phone with the customer to determine if there is a reasonable explanation for the order. If there is not a satisfactory answer the order is rejected and the DEA is contacted.

137. In 2019 Purdue Pharma and its related entities received 16,220 orders of which 2461 orders were flagged and 10 were reported to DEA.

138. In the first two months of 2020 Purdue Pharma and its related entities 2084 orders were received with 340 orders being flagged and 10 orders reported to DEA.

139. Under the SOP there is not a limit set on orders reported to the DEA before additional steps are taken to investigate the reasons for multiple reports or before a business relationship is terminated.

140. In addition, in reviewing the Wholesaler Due Diligence Reports a question arises whether or not there is adequate staff to review and to follow up on any issues identified from the questionnaires such as those outlined in paragraph 128 above.

141. Some of Purdue Pharma's customers have homegrown suspicious order monitoring systems. Little detail is provided for some of those systems and in some cases, customers refused to provide detail about their system. In addition, some of these customers have not had the DEA review the effectiveness of the system.

142. Purdue Pharma's records reviewed to date reflect that at least one customer does not access a PMP system to check if their customer is patients are getting multiple prescriptions filled raising further concerns about monitoring efforts. It is unclear from the records reviewed whether this is due to state law restrictions on access to PMP data or if it is due to some other factor.

143. **Purdue Pharma is making an effort to monitor for suspicious orders. However, several steps could possibly strengthen the current system. An expert with experience as former Chief of Staff at DEA, Jodi Avergun, has been hired to review in detail the current system and to determine what, if any, recommendations could be made to strengthen it. The following may be areas to be examined: hiring additional staff or contracting with a third party to enable a more thorough review and follow up of the annual Wholesale Due Diligence Questionnaires, to allow for a more in-depth review of “homegrown” suspicious order monitoring systems, and to conduct more site visits that should be prioritized based on volume of activity and numbers of suspicious orders flagged.**

144. **In addition, her review could include a recommendation to amend the SOPs setting forth under what conditions, if any, future orders should be stopped or curtailed if monitoring identifies a pattern of repeated suspicious orders from a wholesaler, a response to the annual questionnaire raises concerns of an unreasonable risk of diversion of opioid product, and/or a site visit leads to a concern that an unreasonable risk of diversion or theft of opioid product exists.**

### **LOBBYING**

145. Under the Injunction Part II Section D Purdue Pharma agreed to certain restrictions related to lobbying. At the federal level Purdue Pharma has a one person government affairs department that according to former V.P. of Federal Governmental Affairs, only monitors Congressional activity that may be relevant to Purdue Pharma or the pharmaceutical industry generally.

146. Assisting former V.P. of Federal Government Affairs in monitoring efforts was Director of Health Policy at Purdue Pharma, who is assuming the role performed by former V.P.

of Federal Government Affairs with reference to the monitoring of federal government activities following his retirement.

147. Former V.P. of Federal Government Affairs represented that Purdue Pharma and its related entities conducts no federal executive branch agency lobbying. However, he did review on a regular basis the Federal Register and other subscription services that may report on the DEA, the Food and Drug Administration and the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid.

148. In the most recent federal lobbying disclosure former V.P. of Federal Government Affairs on behalf of Purdue Pharma represented in the fourth quarter of 2019 the company spent \$200,000 on lobbying activities on substance abuse and addiction in the health care and alcohol and drug general areas which appears consistent with the Injunction.

149. Purdue Pharma and its related entities contracted with a lobbying firm during 2019.

150. In its fourth quarter 2019 federal lobbying disclosure form the lobbying firm notified the government that on behalf of Purdue Pharma the consulting group had monitored activities related to drug abuse, misuse and prevention efforts.

151. Former V.P. of Federal Government Affairs provided information that law firms have been hired for monitor activities as well.

152. One firm does not appear to have lobbied on behalf of Purdue Pharma during the fourth quarter of 2019 based on federal lobbying disclosure forms.

153. The other law firm did file a report for activities relating to access to abuse deterrent pain medication in the third quarter of 2019 and its filing for the fourth quarter suggests that its lobbying concluded on that activity reported in the third quarter. The last bill Purdue paid the firm was in December 2018.

154. While it is impossible to rule out an indirect benefit that may have accrued to Purdue Pharma the records reviewed to this point do not reflect any lobbying being done by Purdue Pharma that would be contrary to the provisions of the Injunction.

155. For example, one retained lobbying firm was engaged on behalf of the Association for Accessible Medicine in connection with labeling of generic drugs which could possibly lead to a promotion of generic opioid products.

156. **I recommend that any agreement with any of the federal government lobbyists or consultants identified herein hereafter be in writing and contain provisions spelling out in detail the Injunction prohibitions on lobbying and the agreement of the lobbyists or consultants to comply with the Injunction as it relates to lobbying. Purdue Pharma agrees with this Recommendation and has committed to implementing it.**

157. The Injunction related only to direct lobbying and does not appear by the letter of the Injunction to cover indirect efforts or to restrict Purdue Pharma from being the beneficiary of indirect efforts.

158. The Injunction requires that all persons engaged in lobbying on behalf of Purdue Pharma certify they have read the Injunction and understand its requirements. The lobbyists underwent a training on the Injunction.

159. **I recommend that all federal lobbyists and consultants be required to furnish quarterly written reports identifying any and all issues and matters they lobbied or engaged in on behalf of Purdue Pharma and its related entities together with a certification by all lobbyists that they have abided by the conditions of the Injunction related to lobbying. Purdue Pharma agrees with this Recommendation and has committed to implementing it.**

160. The Injunction Part II Section D restriction on lobbying also impacts efforts at the state and local government. The state and local efforts are conducted by the State Policy and Government Affairs Group within Purdue Pharma and its related entities under the direction of Purdue Pharma Executive Director, Head of Government Affairs.

161. Purdue Pharma contracts with 22 lobbying firms in 22 states to keep abreast of state legislative activities and a limited amount of state regulatory activities. The firms enter into a master contract that is subsequently extended by an amendment at the expiration of the most recent term. Most of the agreements and extensions were executed before the Injunction so there is no reference to the requirements under the Injunction.

162. Neither the master agreements nor extensions define in any detail the work to be performed under the contract. In later contracts reference is made to Statements of Work and Purchasing Orders; however, no written Statements of Work or Purchase Orders have been created.

163. A review of state disclosure statements from the lobbyist firms retained by Purdue Pharma reflect that lobbying is being done on health care issues generally and opioid issues specifically.

164. For example, the state lobbying firm in Delaware lobbied Senate Bill 34 for Purdue Pharma in 2019. Senate Bill 34 called for the assessment of a fee paid by opioid manufacturers, when and if, the manufacturer exceeds a certain level of production based on morphine milligram equivalents. The collected fee was to be used to pay for prevention services or opioid addiction treatment services. It is unclear from the filing if Purdue Pharma registered for, against or neutral on the bill.

165. Another example of a more general filing was filed by the state lobbying firm working out of the state of Washington. The consulting group disclosed it was paid by Purdue Pharma during the period of September 2019 to December 2019. A time period covered time in which the Injunction came into full force and effect. The work done for Purdue during this period was described as work on Senate Bill 51 involving non opioid directives and coverage of non opioid therapy. It is again unclear if Purdue supported, opposed or remained neutral on the bill.

166. In some cases in the past before the Injunction was issued state lobbyists on behalf of Purdue Pharma registered in opposition to budget bills and substantive bills related to opioid products.

167. For example, the state lobbying firm lobbied and opposed on behalf of Purdue Pharma in the Massachusetts State Legislature SF 1711 and House File 1718 which sought to establish and fund an Opioid Stewardship Fund and HF 3654 that sought to compensate victims of opioid abuse. While the bills were proposed in 2019 those bills might still be considered in a biannual legislative session during 2020. Also, New Jersey disclosure forms filed by the state lobbying firm represented that it is lobbying on behalf of Purdue Pharma in opposing a tax on opioids to fund a prevention and rehabilitation program.

168. The situation in the Massachusetts State Legislature and New Jersey State Legislature may also be at play in the New York State Legislature with S1507A,1507B, and 1507C and S1509A,1509B and 1509C, but it is unclear whether Purdue Pharma registered in opposition to these proposals. The lobbyist filing is confusing. Filings made on behalf of Purdue Pharma suggest that the lobbyist hired by Purdue Pharma was not monitoring the bills; however,

the same filings suggest that Purdue Pharma took a position on the bills but did not disclose what the position was. These bills were enacted into law in April of 2019.

169. **I recommend that all existing contracts and extensions for state lobbyists working on behalf of Purdue Pharma be amended spelling out in detail the specific prohibitions and requirements related to lobbying in the Injunction. The agreements should also include the lobbyist agreement to abide by the requirements and conditions of the Injunction related to lobbying. Purdue Pharma agrees to this recommendation.**

170. **I also recommend that the state lobbyists be required to furnish a quarterly written report identifying any and all issues and matters they lobbied or engaged in for Purdue Pharma, to include the position taken, if any, on any proposed law or regulation. Purdue Pharma agrees to this recommendation.**

171. **I also recommend that the lobbyists provide in writing a certification of compliance with the terms and conditions of the Injunction as it relates to lobbying. Purdue Pharma agrees to this recommendation.**

172. The work of the aforementioned 22 contract lobbying firms is currently supervised by 3 regional directors who handle multiple states and who report to Purdue Pharma Executive Director, Head of Government Affairs.

173. **The range of issues handled at the state level has included active opposition to efforts at the state level to tax opioids and opioid products. Such taxes, I believe, could have an impact on sales and opposition to such taxes could be perceived as promotion of opioid product use. The Company has advised me that it does not agree with this interpretation of the Voluntary Injunction. It believes that lobbying as to the fact of a tax would not constitute “promotion of opioid product use” as promotion is defined in the**

**Voluntary Injunction, see Section I.O. Moreover, the Company believes that such lobbying is not captured under Sections II D.1.a-c of the Voluntary Injunction which prohibits, among other things, lobbying in favor of health care professionals prescribing opioids. Nonetheless, the Company has agreed with the Monitor that-unless it provides written notice to the Monitor-it will refrain from lobbying against the passage of an opioid tax. Additionally, the Company sought clarification that my interpretation of the Voluntary Injunction does not prohibit lobbying on the issue of how an opioid tax would be structured or administered. I agree with that interpretation, and do not believe that advocacy regarding the structure and administration of opioid taxes would violate the Voluntary Injunction.**

174. On other issues directly related to possible promotion Purdue Pharma has not directly opposed legislation adverse to its interests: other similarly situated pharmaceutical companies may have opposed the legislation or rule.

175. Purdue Pharma's Director of Health Policy monitors the various federal relations offices for state governors who have representation in the nation's Capitol.

176. In addition to the 22 state lobbying firms and the state federal relations offices the State Government Affairs Group also subscribes to a daily reporting service with Stateside.

177. Stateside monitors activities at the state level for all 50 states that might impact a pharmaceutical company. In the system at Purdue Pharma certain items have been tabbed, including ADHD prescribing guidelines, drug pricing requirements, price lists, reimportation, Controlled Substances, substance abuse and drug abuse program access, Good Samaritan Laws, Prescription Monitoring Programs (PMP), Take Back Drug Days and drug disposal methods. Issues related to price lists, pricing requirements, reimportation, Controlled Substances, and

PMPs in particular could directly impact opioid and opioid products sales so they need to be closely monitored by the company to assure compliance with the Injunction.

178. All those connected with the state and local lobbying efforts on behalf of Purdue Pharma have purportedly certified they have read the Injunction, understand its requirements and have been trained. I am still in the process of collecting written certifications from all who have lobbied and received the training.

#### **INITIAL COVERED SACKLER PERSONS**

179. Under the Injunction the Initial Covered Sackler Persons were not to be actively engaged in the opioid business in the United States or interfere with compliance with the Injunction.

180. A review of the boards, officers and management team of each entity reflects no Initial Covered Sackler Person serving in any such capacity.

181. As monitor I have received signed certifications from all of the named Initial covered Sackler Persons, including, David A. Sackler, Ilene Sackler, Jonathan D. Sackler, Kathe Sackler, Mortimer D.A. Sackler, Richard S. Sackler, Theresa Sackler and the Executor of the Estate of Beverly Sackler certifying that they have not actively engaged in the opioid business in the United States and have taken no action to interfere with Purdue Pharma's compliance with the Injunction.

#### **MISCELLANEOUS**

182. Purdue Pharma includes a number of subsidiaries. One such subsidiary is Greenfield Bioventures (Greenfield). Greenfield has acted as an investment fund for emerging technologies.

183. A number of investments have been made by Purdue Pharma and its related entities based on representations from the company that involve a wide variety of technologies. However, as related to these investments, Greenfield entered into a license agreement concerning a rescue medication. Under the Part II, Section A, Paragraph 3 iii of the Injunction Purdue Pharma is not prohibited from activities related to rescue medications.

Wherefore, the undersigned Monitor respectfully submits this Initial 90 Day Report with the recommendations contained in Paragraphs 48, 55, 58, 63, 101, 143, 144, 156, 159, 169, 170, 171 and 173 therein.



---

Thomas J. Vilsack  
Monitor

# **EXHIBIT 1**

## **PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION AND VOLUNTARY INJUNCTION**

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

**In re:**

**PURDUE PHARMA L.P., et al.,  
Debtors.<sup>1</sup>**

**PURDUE PHARMA L.P., et al.,  
Plaintiffs,**

**v.**

**COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, et al.,  
Defendants.**

**Chapter 11**

**Case No. 19-23649 (RDD)**

**(Jointly Administered)**

**Adv. Pro. No. 19-08289**

**NINTH AMENDED ORDER PURSUANT TO 11 U.S.C. § 105(a) GRANTING  
MOTION FOR A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

Upon the motion, dated September 18, 2019 (“**September 18 Motion**”), of Purdue Pharma L.P. and certain affiliated debtors, as debtors and debtors in possession (collectively, “**Debtors**”), that are plaintiffs in this adversary proceeding, for an order pursuant to section 105(a) of title 11 of the United States Code (“**Bankruptcy Code**”) and Rule 7065 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure (“**Bankruptcy Rules**”), to (i) enjoin the governmental defendants in this adversary proceeding (“**Governmental Defendants**”) from the commencement or continuation of their active judicial, administrative, or other actions or

<sup>1</sup> The Debtors in these cases, along with the last four digits of each Debtor’s registration number in the applicable jurisdiction, are as follows: Purdue Pharma L.P. (7484), Purdue Pharma Inc. (7486), Purdue Transdermal Technologies L.P. (1868), Purdue Pharma Manufacturing L.P. (3821), Purdue Pharmaceuticals L.P. (0034), Imbrium Therapeutics L.P. (8810), Adlon Therapeutics L.P. (6745), Greenfield BioVentures L.P. (6150), Seven Seas Hill Corp. (4591), Ophir Green Corp. (4594), Purdue Pharma of Puerto Rico (3925), Avrio Health L.P. (4140), Purdue Pharmaceutical Products L.P. (3902), Purdue Neuroscience Company (4712), Nayatt Cove Lifescience Inc. (7805), Button Land L.P. (7502), Rhodes Associates L.P. (N/A), Paul Land Inc. (7425), Quidnick Land L.P. (7584), Rhodes Pharmaceuticals L.P. (6166), Rhodes Technologies (7143), UDF LP (0495), SVC Pharma LP (5717) and SVC Pharma Inc. (4014). The Debtors’ corporate headquarters is located at One Stamford Forum, 201 Tresser Boulevard, Stamford, CT 06901.

proceedings against the Debtors that were or could have been commenced before the commencement of the case (“**Governmental Actions**”) that are included in the chart annexed hereto as Appendix III, as well as the commencement or continuation of any other actions against the Debtors alleging substantially similar facts or causes of action as those alleged in the Governmental Actions, and (ii) enjoin the Governmental Defendants and the private defendants (“**Private Defendants**”) in this adversary proceeding from the commencement or continuation of their active judicial, administrative, or other actions or proceedings, included in the chart annexed hereto as Appendix IV, and the commencement or continuation of other actions alleging substantially similar facts or causes of action as those alleged in the actions identified in Appendix III and Appendix IV, against current or former (a) owners (including any trusts and their respective trustees and beneficiaries), (b) directors, (c) officers, (d) employees, and (e) other similar associated entities of the Debtors that were or could have been commenced before the commencement of the case (“**Related Parties**,” as identified in Appendix IV,<sup>2</sup> and the claims

---

<sup>2</sup> The Related Parties are: The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories Inc.; Purdue Pharma Technologies Inc.; PLP Associates Holdings L.P.; PLP Associates Holdings Inc.; BR Holdings Associates L.P.; BR Holdings Associates Inc.; Rosebay Medical Company L.P.; Rosebay Medical Company, Inc.; Beacon Company; PRA Holdings Inc.; Pharmaceutical Research Associates Inc.; Purdue Holdings L.P.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Coventry Technologies L.P.; MNP Consulting Limited; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Marianna Sackler; Estate of Mortimer Sackler; Estate of Raymond Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Raymond Sackler Trust; Beverly Sackler, Richard S. Sackler, and Jonathan D. Sackler, as Trustees Under Trust Agreement Dated November 5, 1964; Beverly Sackler, Richard S. Sackler, and Jonathan D. Sackler, as Trustees Under Trust Agreement Dated November 5, 1974; Paulo Costa; Cecil Pickett; Ralph Snyderman; Judith Lewent; Craig Landau; Mark Timney; Stuart D. Baker; Frank Peter Boer; John Stewart; Russell Gasdia; Marv Kelly; Shelli Liston; Heather Weaver; Doug Powers; Lori Fuller; Rodney Davis; Brandon Worley; Donald Leathers; Wendy Kay; Michael Madden; LeAvis Sullivan; Jeffrey Ward; Beth Taylor; Leigh Varnadore; Paul Kitchin; Mark Waldrop; Mark Radcliffe; Mark Ross; Patty Carnes; Carol Debord; Jeff Waugh; Shane Cook; James David Haddox; Aida Maxsam; Tessa Rios; Amy K. Thompson; Joe Coggins; Lyndsie Fowler; Mitchell “Chip” Fisher; Rebecca Sterling; Vanessa Weatherspoon; Chris

against them described in this paragraph, the “**Related-Party Claims**”); and the Court having jurisdiction to decide the Motion and the relief requested therein under 28 U.S.C. §§ 157(a)-(b) and 1334(b); and there being due and sufficient notice of the Motion; and the Court having reviewed the Complaint, the September 18 Motion, the Debtors’ brief in support of the September 18 Motion, the declarations in support of the September 18 Motion, and other evidence and argument submitted by the Debtors in support thereof; all pleadings filed in support of the September 18 Motion; and all objections filed in opposition or partial opposition to the September 18 Motion, as well as all filed letters in response to the September 18 Motion; and upon the record of and representations made at the hearing held by the Court on the September 18 Motion’s request for entry of a preliminary injunction on October 11, 2019 (the “**October 11 Hearing**”) and at the hearing held on November 6, 2019 (the “**November 6 Hearing**”); and, after due deliberation and for the reasons set forth on the record by the Court at the Hearings, good and sufficient cause appearing having entered Orders on October 11, 2019 granting the Motion in part and on October 18, 2019 and November 6, 2019 amending such Order; and such Orders having contemplated a procedure to amend the Orders further; and having entered Orders on November 20, 2019, December 9, 2019, January 2, 2020, February 17, 2020 and March 4, 2020, amending such Orders further and enjoining actions brought by Additional Plaintiffs; and upon the Court having reviewed the Debtors’ motion to extend the Preliminary Injunction for an additional 180 days filed on March 4 (“**March 4 Motion**,” together with the September 18 Motion, the “**Motions**”), the declaration in support of the March 4 Motion, the Debtors’ brief in support of the March 4 Motion, all pleadings filed in support of the March 4 Motion; and all

---

Hargrave; Brandon Hassenfuss; Joe Read; Andrew T. Stokes; Nathan C. Grace; Jaclyn P. Gatling; Leslie Roberson; Barbara C. Miller; Briann Parson-Barnes; Becca Beck Harville; Lindsey Bonifacio; Tammy Heyward; James Speed; Damon Storhoff; Diana C. Muller; and Draupadi Daley.

objections filed in opposition or partial opposition to the March 4 Motion; and upon the record made at the telephonic hearing held on March 18, 2020 (“**March 18 Hearing**,” together with the October 11 Hearing and the November 6 Hearing, the “**Hearings**”); and upon good and sufficient cause appearing to amend and extend such orders as provided therein, the Court grants the Debtors’ request to amend and extend the orders as provided in this Amended Order, which amends and supersedes the prior orders. Now, therefore, the Court finds and concludes as follows:

(a) The Defendants in this adversary proceeding are the Governmental Defendants and the Private Defendants, that, along with the Additional Plaintiffs, are listed in the “Underlying Plaintiffs” column of each of the charts annexed hereto as Appendix III and Appendix IV, with such Appendices being made a part of and incorporated in this Order. The Defendants in this adversary proceeding and the Additional Plaintiffs are all plaintiffs in judicial, administrative, or other actions or proceedings that seek to hold the Debtors and/or the Related Parties, as identified in Appendix IV, liable in connection with claims and/or causes of action arising out of or otherwise related to the Debtors’ prescription opioid business.

(b) The Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 157(a)-(b) and 1334(b). This is a core proceeding pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2).

(c) The Debtors have demonstrated that the continuation of the active litigation against them and the Related Parties, identified in Appendix III and Appendix IV, respectively, would result in irreparable harm to the Debtors and their reorganization.

(d) The representatives of the Raymond Sackler family and of the Mortimer Sackler family (collectively, the “**Sackler Families**”) agreed on the record at the October

11 Hearing to toll all applicable statutes of limitations and similar time limits on the commencement of Additional Actions against any member of the Sackler Families, and to treat as inoperative all deadlines (including deadlines for appeals) in any currently pending Related Party Claim against any member of the Sackler Families, for the duration of this preliminary injunction.

(e) Accordingly, this Court finds it appropriate to enter a preliminary injunction as provided herein pursuant to section 105(a) of the Bankruptcy Code and Rule 7065 of the Bankruptcy Rules.

(f) The legal and factual bases set forth in the Complaint, the Motions, other supporting papers, and at the Hearings establish just cause for the relief granted herein.

(g) Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, the Ad Hoc Group of Non-Consenting States (as listed on the October 11, 2019 Verified Statement pursuant to Bankruptcy Rule 2019 filed under Docket No. 296 of Case No. 19-23649), the ad hoc committee of government and other contingent litigation claimants and each of its members (as listed on the October 10, 2019 Verified Statement pursuant to Bankruptcy Rule 2019 filed under Docket No. 279 of Case No. 19-23649), and the Multi-State Governmental Entities Group and each of its members<sup>3</sup> (as listed on the October 30,

---

<sup>3</sup> The following members of the Multi-State Governmental Entities Group are not Potential Opt-Out Parties and are instead bound to the terms of this Order until October 5, 2020: (1) Bryant C. Dunaway, in his official capacity as the District Attorney General for the Thirteenth Judicial District, Tennessee; (2) Jennings H. Jones, in his official capacity as the District Attorney General for the Sixteenth Judicial District, Tennessee; (3) Robert J. Carter, in his official

2019 Verified Statement pursuant to Bankruptcy Rule 2019 filed under Docket No. 409 of Case No. 19-23649) (collectively, the “**Potential Opt-Out Parties**”) have each consented and agreed to continue to abide by the terms of the *Eighth Amended Order Pursuant To 11 U.S.C. § 105(a) Granting Motion For A Preliminary Injunction*, without the need to have any order entered against them.

Based on these findings, it is hereby:

ORDERED, that the Governmental Defendants, other than those who are Potential Opt-Out Parties, the Private Defendants, and the Additional Plaintiffs that have been bound by the Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, and Seventh Amended Orders are prohibited and enjoined from (i) the commencement or continuation of their active judicial, administrative, or other actions or proceedings against the Debtors and/or Related Parties that were or could have been commenced before the commencement of the case under this title against the Debtors and/or the Related Parties arising from or in any way relating to the Debtors’ prescription opioid business, including the actions reflected in Appendix III and Appendix IV, as well as (ii) from commencing or continuing any other actions against the Debtors or Related Parties alleging substantially similar facts or causes of action as those alleged in actions reflected in Appendix III and Appendix IV, in each case through and including Monday, October 5, 2020. The preliminary injunction period may be extended by further order of the Court.

ORDERED, that each Potential Opt-Out Party may withdraw its consent on July 8, 2020 (the “**Opt-Out Date**”)—by filing with the Bankruptcy Court a notice (a “**Withdrawal Notice**”) in the form attached hereto as Appendix II. Each Potential Opt-Out Party filing a Withdrawal

---

capacity as the District Attorney General for the Seventeenth Judicial District, Tennessee; (4) Brent A. Cooper, in his official capacity as the District Attorney General for the Twenty-Second Judicial District, Tennessee; and (5) Lisa S. Zavogiannis, in her official capacity as the District Attorney General for the Thirty-First Judicial District, Tennessee.

Notice must send a copy of the same to the Debtors' counsel at least two business days before such filing. If any Potential Opt-Out Party files a Withdrawal Notice on the Opt-Out Date, then, no later than three business days after the Opt-Out Date, counsel for the Debtors shall submit to the Court for immediate entry a new proposed order that, upon its entry, will terminate the voluntary compliance of and instead bind each Potential Opt-Out Party that timely filed and served a Withdrawal Notice to the same terms imposed on other parties by the this Order from the Opt-Out Date until October 5, 2020. For the avoidance of doubt, entry of this order shall not impair any rights of Potential Opt-Out Parties to appeal any subsequent order entered in connection with a Withdrawal Notice as contemplated herein.

ORDERED, that the March 4 Motion constitutes a joint motion of the Debtors and UCC to extend the stay beyond the Initial Stay Period as provided in paragraph 2 of the Amended and Restated Case Stipulation Among the Debtors, the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors and Certain Related Parties, *In re: Purdue Pharma, L.P. et al.*, Case No. 19:23649 (RDD) (Nov. 20, 2019) [ECF No. 518] (“**UCC Stipulation**”). All obligations under the UCC Stipulation, inclusive of obligations of any Covered Party as defined therein, that remain in effect during the Stay Period, as defined therein, shall remain in full force and effect so long as the Preliminary Injunction, as amended and extended, remains in effect. For the avoidance of doubt, the Initial Stay Period as defined in the UCC Stipulation shall expire on April 8, 2020.

ORDERED, that the Debtors in these chapter 11 cases continue to be subject to the Voluntary Injunction annexed hereto as Appendix I through and including October 5, 2020.

ORDERED, that the Debtors need not give security in connection with this injunctive relief.

ORDERED, that this Order shall be promptly filed in the Clerk’s Office and entered into the record.

ORDERED, that the Debtors are authorized to take all steps necessary or appropriate to carry out this Order.

ORDERED, that nothing in this Order shall prevent the Debtors from seeking a further extension of the requested injunction.

ORDERED, that if, while the preliminary injunction provided for in this Order is effective, either (i) any inactive litigation currently pending against the Debtors or Related Parties becomes active, or (ii) any new action is commenced against the Debtors or Related Parties (in either case, an “**Additional Action**”), the Debtors may promptly serve the plaintiff or plaintiffs in such Additional Action (“**Applicable Plaintiff**”) with a copy of the Complaint, the Motions, the Debtors’ memoranda of law in support of the Motions, and this Order (the “**Service Documents**”). The Debtors shall file a notice of such service on the docket promptly after service. If the Applicable Plaintiff in such Additional Action does not file and serve an objection within seven (7) days of service of the Service Documents, the Court may determine whether such Additional Action should be enjoined pursuant to this Order without further proceedings. If the Applicable Plaintiff files and serves an objection, the Debtors shall have the right to file and serve a response to the objection within seven (7) days of service of the objection, after which the Court may determine whether such Additional Action should be enjoined pursuant to this Order without further proceedings, or either party may seek to schedule and provide notice of a hearing.

ORDERED, that all applicable statutes of limitations and similar time limits on the commencement of Additional Actions, and all deadlines (including deadlines for appeals) in

any currently pending Governmental Action, Related Party Claim or action brought by an Additional Plaintiff (including as agreed on the record at the October 11 Hearing by the representatives of the Sackler Families), shall be tolled or otherwise inoperative for the duration of this preliminary injunction. This is without prejudice to any party's rights to assert that any currently pending Governmental Action, Related Party Claim or claim brought by an Additional Plaintiff is time barred, or that commencement of any Additional Action, or any other action taken by a party with respect to any Governmental Action, Related Party Claim or Additional Plaintiff after the entry of this Order would have been time barred or untimely had it been commenced or taken before the entry of this Order.

ORDERED, that nothing in this Order shall affect or abrogate the automatic stay as to the Debtors under section 362 of the Bankruptcy Code.

ORDERED, that the time for all defendants to answer the Complaint is extended to October 19, 2020, subject to further extension by agreement of the parties and/or order of the Court. All claims and defenses of the parties, including those under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure made applicable to this proceeding by Rule 7012 of the Bankruptcy Rules, are expressly preserved.

ORDERED, that the Pre-Trial Conference in this adversary proceeding, currently scheduled for April 8, 2020 at 10:00 am (Prevailing Eastern Time), is adjourned to October 19, 2020 at 10:00 am (Prevailing Eastern Time) before the Honorable Robert D. Drain, United States Bankruptcy Judge, at the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York, 300 Quarropas St., White Plains, New York, NY 10601.

ORDERED, that this Court shall retain jurisdiction to hear and determine all matters arising from or related to the implementation, interpretation, or enforcement of this Order.

Dated: April 14, 2020  
White Plains, New York

*/s/Robert D. Drain* \_\_\_\_\_  
THE HONORABLE ROBERT D. DRAIN  
UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

**Appendix I**

**Voluntary Injunction**

## I. DEFINITIONS

- A. “Bankruptcy Court” or “Court” shall mean the court presiding over the chapter 11 proceedings *In re Purdue Pharma L.P. et al.*, Case No. 19-23649-RDD (S.D.N.Y.).
- B. “Cancer-Related Pain Care” shall mean care that provides relief from pain caused by active cancer or ongoing cancer treatment, as distinguished from treatment provided during remission.
- C. “CDC Guideline Recommendations” shall mean the 12 enumerated Recommendations published by the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) for the prescribing of opioid pain medication for patients 18 and older in primary care settings as part of its 2016 Guideline for Prescribing Opioids for Chronic Pain (CDC Guidelines), as updated or amended by the CDC.
- D. “Company” shall mean the Debtors as defined in these chapter 11 proceedings *In re Purdue Pharma L.P. et al.*, Case No. 19-23649-RDD (S.D.N.Y.).
- E. “Direct Customer Data” shall mean transaction information that the Company collects relating to the Company’s direct customers’ orders, including direct customer’s wholesale orders, order history, and customer files.
- F. “Downstream Customer Data” shall mean transaction information that the Company collects relating to the Company’s direct customers’ sales to downstream customers, including chargeback data tied to the Company providing certain discounts, “867 data,” and IQVIA data.
- G. “End-of-Life Care” shall mean care for persons with a terminal illness or at high risk for dying in the near future in hospice care, hospitals, long-term care settings, or at home.
- H. “Health Care Provider” shall mean any U.S.-based physician, nurse practitioner, physician assistant, dentist, pharmacist, podiatrist, nurse, or other person engaged in the business of providing health care services and/or prescribing an Opioid Product and any medical facility, practice, hospital, clinic, or pharmacy engaged in providing health care services and/or prescribing an Opioid Product in the United States.
- I. “Including but not limited to,” when followed by a list or examples, shall mean that list or examples are illustrative instances only and shall not be read to be restrictive.
- J. “In-Kind Support” shall mean payment or assistance in the form of goods, commodities, services, or anything else of value.
- K. “Initial Covered Sackler Persons” shall mean the Estate of Beverly Sackler, David A. Sackler, Ilene Sackler, Jonathan D. Sackler, Kathe Sackler, Mortimer D.A. Sackler, Richard S. Sackler, Theresa Sackler, any trusts of which any of the foregoing are beneficiaries, and the trustees thereof (solely in their capacities as such), each Shareholder Party and each other entity or person that directly or indirectly owns equity in, or has voting control over, any of the Debtors, and in the event of the death of an

Initial Covered Sackler Person who is a natural person, other than a natural person who is an Initial Covered Sackler Person solely in the capacity as a trustee, the estate of such person.

- L. “Lobby” and “Lobbying” shall have the same meaning as such terms have under U.S. federal law and the law governing the person or entity being lobbied.
- M. “Opioid(s)” shall mean all natural, semi-synthetic, or synthetic chemicals that interact with opioid receptors on nerve cells in the body and brain. The term “Opioids” shall not mean (i) methadone, buprenorphine, buprenorphine/naloxone (oral/sublingual), suboxone, and other substances when used exclusively to treat opioid or other substance use disorders, abuse, addiction, or overdose; (ii) raw materials and/or immediate precursors used in the manufacture or study of Opioids or Opioid Products, but only when such materials and/or immediate precursors are sold or marketed exclusively to DEA-licensed manufacturers or DEA-licensed researchers; or (iii) Opioids listed by the DEA as Schedule IV drugs pursuant to the federal Controlled Substances Act.
- N. “Opioid Product(s)” shall mean all natural, semi-synthetic, or synthetic chemicals that interact with opioid receptors on nerve cells in the body and brain, and that are approved by the U.S. Food & Drug Administration (FDA) and listed by the DEA as Schedule II or III drugs pursuant to the federal Controlled Substances Act (including but not limited to codeine, fentanyl, hydrocodone, hydromorphone, meperidine, methadone, morphine, oxycodone, oxymorphone, tapentadol, tramadol, and buprenorphine for the treatment of pain). The term “Opioid Products(s)” shall not mean (i) methadone, buprenorphine, buprenorphine/naloxone (oral/sublingual), suboxone, and other substances to treat opioid or other substance use disorders, abuse, addiction, or overdose; (ii) raw materials and/or immediate precursors used in the manufacture or study of Opioids or Opioid Products, but only when such materials and/or immediate precursors are sold or marketed exclusively to DEA-licensed manufacturers or DEA-licensed researchers; or (iii) Opioid Products listed by the DEA as Schedule IV drugs pursuant to the federal Controlled Substances Act.
- O. “Promote,” “Promoting,” and “Promotion” shall mean the dissemination of information by the Company to a Third Party that is either likely or intended to influence prescribing practices of Health Care Providers in favor of prescribing greater amounts, quantities, doses, and/or strengths of Opioid Products.
- P. “Section” shall mean, unless the context requires otherwise, a Section of this injunction.
- Q. “Suspicious Order” shall have the same meaning as provided by the Controlled Substances Act, 21 U.S.C. §§ 801-904, and the regulations promulgated thereunder and analogous state laws and regulations
- R. “Third Party” shall mean any person or entity other than the Company or a government entity.
- S. “Treatment of Pain” shall mean the provision of therapeutic modalities to alleviate or reduce pain.

- T. “Unbranded Information” shall mean any information regarding an Opioid or Opioid Product that does not identify a specific product(s).

## II. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

### A. Ban on Promotion

1. The Company shall not Promote Opioids or Opioid Products, including by:
  - a. Employing or contracting with sales representatives or other persons to Promote Opioids or Opioid Products to Health Care Providers or patients;
  - b. Using speakers, key opinion leaders, thought leaders, lecturers, and/or speaking events for Promotion of Opioids or Opioid Products;
  - c. Sponsoring, or otherwise providing financial support or In-Kind Support to medical education programs;
  - d. Creating, sponsoring, operating, controlling, or otherwise providing financial support or In-Kind Support to any website, network and/or social or other media account for the Promotion of Opioids or Opioid Products;
  - e. Creating, sponsoring, distributing, or otherwise providing financial support or In-Kind Support for materials Promoting Opioids or Opioid Products, including but not limited to brochures, newsletters, pamphlets, journals, books, and guides;
  - f. Creating, sponsoring, or otherwise providing financial support or In-Kind Support for advertisements that Promote Opioids or Opioid Products, including but not limited to internet advertisements or similar content, and providing hyperlinks or otherwise directing internet traffic to advertisements;
  - g. Engaging in Internet search engine optimization or other techniques designed to Promote Opioids or Opioid Products by improving rankings or making content appear among the top results in an Internet search or otherwise be more visible or more accessible to the public on the Internet; and
  - h. Engaging in Internet marketing techniques that Promote Opioids or Opioid Products by identifying or generating sales leads, including through pop up ads or information obtained from web forms completed by prospective patients or consumers.
2. Notwithstanding Sections II.A.1 and II.C, the Company may:
  - a. Maintain corporate websites;

- b. Maintain a website for any Opioid Product that contains principally the following content: the FDA-approved package insert, dosage strengths, dosage forms, packaging configurations, and medication guides; a statement directing patients or caregivers to speak with a licensed Health Care Provider; Risk Evaluation and Mitigation Strategy (REMS) materials; contact information to report an adverse event or product complaint; and/or information regarding savings programs, savings cards, vouchers, coupons, or rebate programs for the Company's Opioid Products.
- c. Provide information or support the provision of information, as expressly required by (i) law, (ii) settlement agreement, (iii) court order, including order of the Bankruptcy Court, or (iv) any state or federal government agency, including providing all information necessary in order for the Company to comply with its regulatory obligations pursuant to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and/or (v) provide information about legal proceedings involving the Company;
- d. Engage Health Care Providers or other Third Parties to assist the Company in responding to, preparing for, and participating in, any initiatives, advisory committees, working groups, action plans, boards, meetings and/or hearings by any state or federal government or state or federal agencies or regulators, including the Food and Drug Administration.
- e. Provide the following by mail, electronic mail, on or through the Company's corporate or product websites or through other electronic or digital methods: FDA-approved package insert, medication guide, approved labeling for Opioid Products, Risk Evaluation and Mitigation Strategy materials, or other prescribing information or guidelines for Opioid Products that are published by a state or federal government agency with jurisdiction;
- f. Provide scientific and/or medical information in response to an unsolicited request by a Health Care Provider concerning Opioid Products by providing truthful, balanced, non-misleading, non-promotional scientific or medical information that is responsive to the specific request. Such responses should be handled by medical or scientific personnel at the Company who are independent from the sales or marketing departments;
- g. Provide a response to any unsolicited question or request from a patient or caregiver by (i) directing the patient or caregiver to the FDA-approved labeling and reviewing the prescribing information with the patient as relevant to their inquiry, and, to the extent the question cannot be answered solely by reference to a specific provision of the FDA-approved labeling, providing a response that is truthful, balanced, non-misleading and fully consistent with the FDA-approved labeling, if applicable;

- (ii) recommending that the patient or caregiver speak with a licensed Health Care Provider without naming any specific provider or healthcare institution; (iii) directing the patient or caregiver to speak with their insurance carrier regarding coverage of an Opioid Product; and/or (iv) directing the patient or caregiver to information concerning savings programs, vouchers, coupons, or rebate programs for the Company's Opioid Products;
  - h. Provide information to a payor, formulary committee, distributor, or other similar entity with knowledge and expertise in the area of health care economics concerning the cost or availability of a Company Opioid Product, including the costs compared to the cost of an Opioid Product manufactured or distributed by another company. Such information may include information about the stocking of the Opioid Product; product attributes of the Opioid Product as described in the FDA-approved labeling; tier status; applicable prescribing guidelines that are consistent with the FDA-approved labeling; step-edits for Opioid Products; restrictions; and/or prior authorization status concerning an Opioid Product;
  - i. Sponsor or provide financial support or In-Kind Support for an accredited or approved continuing medical education program required by either an FDA-approved Risk Evaluation and Mitigation Strategy program, other federal or state law or regulation, or settlement, through an independent Third Party, which shall be responsible for determining the program's content without the participation of Company;
  - j. Provide Unbranded Information in connection with managing pain in End-of-Life Care and/or Cancer-Related Pain Care relating to: the use of Opioids for the Treatment of Pain, as long as the Unbranded Information identifies Company as the source of the information; and
  - k. Provide information about, discuss, or comment on, issues regarding mechanisms for preventing opioid abuse and misuse, including (i) abuse deterrent formulations and the use of blister packaging for opioid medications; (ii) the prevention, education, and treatment of opioid use disorders or opioid abuse, addiction, or overdose, including medication-assisted treatment for opioid addiction; and/or (iii) rescue medications for opioid overdose.
3. The Company shall not engage in the following specific Promotional activity relating to any products that are indicated for the treatment of Opioid-induced side effects. For the avoidance of doubt, nothing in this Section prohibits the Company's provision or dissemination of information or activities relating to: (i) the treatment of opioid use disorders; (ii) the prevention, education, and treatment of opioid abuse, addiction, or overdose, including medication-assisted treatment for opioid addiction; and/or (iii) rescue medications for opioid overdose:

- a. Employing or contracting with sales representatives or other persons to Promote products that are indicated for the treatment of Opioid-induced side effects to Health Care Providers or patients;
  - b. Creating, sponsoring, or otherwise providing financial support or In-Kind Support for advertisements that Promote products that are indicated for the treatment of Opioid-induced side effects, including but not limited to internet advertisements or similar content, and providing hyperlinks or otherwise directing internet traffic to advertisements; and
  - c. Engaging in any other Promotion of products that are indicated for the treatment of Opioid-induced side effects in a manner that encourages the utilization of Opioids or Opioid Products or normalizes the use of Opioids or Opioid Products for chronic pain.
4. Notwithstanding Section II.A.3 directly above, the Company may engage in other marketing activities for products that are indicated or used for the treatment of Opioid-induced side effects, so long as such activities do not Promote Opioids or Opioid Products. For the avoidance of doubt, nothing in Sections II.A.3 or 4 shall limit or otherwise restrict the ability of the Company to Promote products for occasional constipation or restrict the Company from Promoting (i) products relating to the treatment of opioid use disorders; (ii) products relating to the treatment of opioid abuse, addiction, or overdose, including medication-assisted treatment for opioid addiction; and/or (iii) rescue medications for opioid overdose.
5. Treatment of Pain
  - a. The Company shall not engage in Promotion of the Treatment of Pain in a manner that encourages the use of Opioids or Opioid Products.
  - b. The Company shall not Promote the concept that pain is undertreated in a manner that encourages the use of Opioids or Opioid Products.
  - c. The Company shall not knowingly use Third Parties to engage in the Promotion of the Treatment of Pain or Promote the concept that pain is undertreated in manners that encourage the use of Opioids or Opioid Products.
6. To the extent that the Company engages in conduct permitted by Section II.A.2 above, the Company shall do so in a manner that is:
  - a. Consistent with the CDC Guidelines Recommendations, as applicable; and
  - b. Truthful, not misleading, accurate, and not deceptive.

7. For the avoidance of doubt, nothing in this injunction shall be construed or used to prohibit the Company in any way whatsoever from taking legal or factual positions in litigation, the bankruptcy proceedings, investigations, regulatory actions and initiatives, or other legal or administrative proceedings, or exercising its right to legally challenge the enactment of any federal, state, or local legislation, rule, or regulation, or in any way whatsoever prohibit or limit the Company's right to make public statements or respond to media reports or inquires relating to any legal, administrative, regulatory, or legislative proceedings.

**B. No Financial Reward or Discipline Based on Volume of Opioid Sales**

1. The Company shall not provide financial incentives to its sales and marketing employees, or take disciplinary actions against its sales and marketing employees, that are directly based on, or tied to, sales volume or sales quotas for Opioid Products, unless otherwise permitted by the Bankruptcy Court.
2. The Company shall not offer or pay any remuneration directly or through a Third Party, to or from any person in return for the prescribing, sale, use or distribution of Opioid Product. For the avoidance of doubt, this shall not prohibit the provision of rebates and/or chargebacks.

**C. Ban on Funding/Grants to Third Parties to Promote Opioids**

1. The Company shall not provide financial support or In-Kind Support to any Third Party for purposes of Promoting Opioids or Opioid Products. For avoidance of doubt, nothing in this Section prevents the Company from directly or indirectly supporting Third Parties as required by any Judgment, court order, including order of the Bankruptcy Court, settlement, or federal or state law or regulation.
2. The Company shall not operate, control, create, sponsor, or provide financial support or In-Kind Support to any medical society or patient advocacy group for the purpose of Promoting Opioids or Opioid Products. For avoidance of doubt, nothing in this Section prevents the Company from supporting any medical society or patient advocacy group as required by any Judgment, court order, including order of the Bankruptcy Court, settlement, or federal or state law or regulation.
3. For the purposes of Promoting Opioids or Opioid Products, the Company shall not provide links to any Third Party website or materials or otherwise distribute materials created by a Third Party relating to any Opioids or Opioid Products. For avoidance of doubt, nothing in this Section prevents the Company from providing links to any Third Party website or materials or otherwise distributing materials created by a Third Parties that the Company supports as required by any Judgment, court order, including order of the Bankruptcy Court, settlement, or federal or state law or regulation.

4. The Company shall not knowingly use a Third Party, including Health Care Providers, to engage in any activity that the Company itself would be prohibited from engaging in pursuant to the injunction.
5. No director, officer, or management-level employee of the Company may concurrently serve as a director, board member, employee, agent, or officer of any entity that engages in Promotion relating to Opioids, Opioid Products, the Opioid-related Treatment of Pain, or products indicated to treat Opioid-related side effects.
6. The Company shall not advocate for the appointment of persons to the board, or hiring persons to the staff, of any entity that principally engages in the Promotion of Opioids and Opioid Products. For avoidance of doubt, nothing in this paragraph shall prohibit the Company from fully and accurately responding to unsolicited requests or inquiries about a person's fitness to serve as an employee or Board member at any such entity.
7. For the avoidance of doubt, nothing in Section II.C or this injunction shall be construed or used to prohibit the Company from providing financial or In-Kind Support to, or disseminating information about, Third Parties, including medical societies and patient advocate groups, who are principally involved in issues relating to (i) the treatment of opioid use disorders; (ii) the prevention, education, and treatment of opioid abuse, addiction, or overdose, including medication-assisted treatment for opioid addiction; and/or (iii) rescue medications for opioid overdose.

#### **D. Lobbying Restrictions**

1. The Company shall not directly, or by employing or controlling a Third Party, Lobby for the enactment of any federal, state, or local legislation or promulgation of any rule or regulation that:
  - a. Encourages or requires Health Care Providers to prescribe Opioids or sanctions Health Care Providers for failing to prescribe Opioids or failing to treat pain with Opioids;
  - b. Would have the effect of limiting access to any non-Opioid alternative pain treatments; or
  - c. Pertains to the classification of any Opioid or Opioid Product as a scheduled drug under the Controlled Substances Act.
2. The Company shall not directly, or by employing or controlling a Third Party, Lobby against the enactment of any federal, state or local legislation or promulgation of any rule or regulation that supports:

- a. The use of non-pharmacologic therapy and/or non-Opioid pharmacologic therapy to treat chronic pain over or instead of Opioid therapy, including but not limited to Third Party payment or reimbursement for such therapies;
  - b. The use and/or prescription of immediate release Opioids instead of extended release Opioids when Opioid therapy is initiated, including but not limited to Third Party reimbursement or payment for such prescriptions.
  - c. The prescribing of the lowest effective dose of an Opioid, including but not limited to Third Party reimbursement or payment for such prescription;
  - d. The limitation of initial prescriptions of Opioids to treat acute pain;
  - e. The prescribing and other means of distribution of naloxone to minimize the risk of overdose, including but not limited to Third Party reimbursement or payment for naloxone.
  - f. The use of urine testing before starting Opioid therapy and annual urine testing when Opioids are prescribed, including but not limited to Third Party reimbursement or payment for such testing;
  - g. Evidence-based treatment (such as using medication-assisted treatment with buprenorphine or methadone in combination with behavioral therapies) for Opioid Use Disorder, including but not limited to third party reimbursement or payment for such treatment; or
  - h. The implementation or use of Opioid drug disposal systems that have proven efficacy for the Company's Opioid Products.
3. The Company shall not directly, or by employing or controlling a Third Party, Lobby against the enactment of any federal, state or local legislation or promulgation of any rule or regulation limiting the operation or use of PDMPs, including, but not limited to, provisions requiring Health Care Providers to review PDMPs when Opioid therapy is initiated and with every prescription thereafter.
  4. Nothing in Section II.D or this Injunction, however, limits the Company from:
    - a. Challenging the enforcement of, or suing to stop the enactment of, or for declaratory or injunctive relief with respect to any legislation, rules, or regulations, including legislation, rules, or regulations relating to any issues referred to in Section II.D.1;
    - b. Communications made by the Company in response to a statute, rule, regulation, or order requiring such communication;

- c. Communications by a representative of the Company appearing before a federal or state legislative or administrative body, committee, or subcommittee as result of a mandatory order, subpoena commanding that person to testify or an unsolicited request from an elected or appointed official, federal or state legislative or administrative body, committee, or subcommittee.
  - d. Responding to an unsolicited request for the input on the passage of legislation or the promulgation of any rule or regulation.
  1. Communications by the Company, including to elected or appointed officials, federal or state legislative or administrative bodies, committees, or subcommittees regarding (i) mechanisms for preventing opioid abuse and misuse, including abuse deterrent formulations and the use of blister packaging for opioid medications, (ii) the prevention, education, and treatment of opioid use disorders or opioid abuse, addiction, or overdose, including medication-assisted treatment for opioid addiction; and/or (iii) rescue medications for opioid overdose.
5. The Company shall require all of its officers, employees and representatives engaged in Lobbying to certify in writing to them that they are aware of and will fully comply with the provisions of this injunction with respect to Lobbying.

**E. Ban on High Dose Opioids**

1. The Company shall abide by any decision by the FDA on the pending Citizens Petition dated September 1, 2017 (docket number FDA-2017-P-5396) requesting a ban on specific high doses of prescription oral and transmucosal Opioids that, when taken as directed, exceed 90 morphine milligram equivalents per day.

**F. Ban on Prescription Savings Programs**

1. The Company shall not directly, or by employing or controlling a Third Party, Promote savings card, vouchers, coupons, or rebate programs to Health Care Providers for any Opioid Product. Nothing in this provision shall prohibit the Company from providing savings cards, vouchers, coupons, or rebate programs, including electronic point-of-dispense programs: (i) in response to requests from Health Care Providers, patients, or other caregivers or (ii) on its website or product-specific websites.
2. The Company shall not directly or through a Third Party provide financial support to any Third Party to avoid the prohibited conduct in Section II.F.1 above.

**G. Self-Monitoring and Reporting of Direct and Downstream Customers.**

1. The Company shall operate an effective monitoring and reporting system that shall include processes and procedures that:

- a. Reasonably analyze all collected Direct Customer Data to identify a Suspicious Order of a Company Opioid Product by a direct customer;
  - b. Reasonably utilize available Downstream Customer Data to identify whether a downstream customer poses a material risk of diversion of a Company Opioid Product;
  - c. Analyze all information that the Company receives that indicates an unreasonable risk of diversion activity of a Company Opioid Product or an unreasonable potential for diversion activity of a Company Opioid Product, by a direct customer or a downstream customer, including reports by employees and customers of the Company, Health Care Providers, law enforcement, state, tribal, or federal agencies, or the media; and
  - d. Unless otherwise required by law, upon a relevant state's request, report to the relevant state agency any direct customer or downstream customer in each state that the Company has identified as part of the monitoring required by (a)-(c), above, and any Company customer relationship in each state that was terminated by the Company because of an unreasonable risk of diversion or unreasonable risk for potential for diversion.
2. Upon request, the Company shall promptly provide reasonable assistance to law enforcement investigations of potential diversion and/or suspicious circumstances involving the Company's Opioid Products subject to, and without waiving, any applicable privilege objections.
  3. If one or more of the nation's three largest pharmaceutical distributors establishes a system to aggregate data concerning transactions of Opioid Products and/or concerning reports of Suspicious Orders of Opioid Products, and the system is designed to use information provided by manufacturers of Opioid Products, the Company shall provide information to such system to the extent reasonably available and feasible, subject to, and without waiving, any applicable privilege objections.
  4. The Company agrees that it will refrain from acting as a distributor of Opioid Products by providing an Opioid Product directly to a retail pharmacy or Health Care Provider or otherwise engaging in activity that requires it to be registered as a distributor under the Controlled Substances Act unless otherwise required by local, state, or federal law. Nothing in this provision, however, prevents the Company from acting as a distributor of medications relating to (i) the treatment of opioid use disorders; (ii) the treatment of opioid abuse, addiction, or overdose, including medication-assisted treatment for opioid addiction; and (iii) rescue medications for opioid overdose.

## **H. Appointment and Responsibilities of Monitor.**

1. The Company shall retain a Monitor. On February 21, 2020, the Debtors retained Thomas J. Vilsack to serve as Monitor.
2. The Monitor shall perform its duties according to the terms of this injunction and shall be vested with all rights and powers reasonably necessary to carry out such powers, duties, authority, and responsibilities enumerated herein.
3. The Monitor shall work with all diligence to confirm and oversee compliance with this injunction, and shall provide reports to the Company's Board of Directors and the Bankruptcy Court as outlined below.
4. The Monitor shall:
  - a. subject to any legally recognized privilege and as necessary or to perform their duties hereunder, have full and complete access to the Company's personnel, books, records, and facilities, and to any other relevant information, as the Monitor may request. The Company shall develop such information as the Monitor may request and shall fully, completely and promptly cooperate with the Monitor. The Monitor may raise with the Court any issues relating to any failure of or delay in such cooperation for an expedited resolution by the Court;
  - b. serve, without bond or other security, at the cost and expense of the Company, with the Monitor's fees subject to final approval by the Court. The Monitor shall have the authority to employ, upon Court approval, at the cost and expense of the Debtors' estates, such consultants, accountants, attorneys, and other representatives and assistants as are necessary to carry out the Monitor's and responsibilities. The Monitor shall serve throughout the term of this injunction and submission of a final report;
  - c. have no obligation, responsibility or liability for the operations of the Company;
  - d. file a report no less than every 90 days regarding compliance by the Company with the terms of this injunction; provided that elements of any such report may be filed under seal or subject to such other confidentiality restrictions contained in the Protective Order. The Court may, in response to such reports, provide further direction to the Monitor as it deems appropriate;
  - e. sign onto the Protective Order entered by the Court in this matter, and any confidentiality agreement consistent with the Protective Order as deemed necessary by the parties, and each of the Monitor's consultants, accountants, attorneys and other representatives and assistants shall also sign onto the Protective Order entered by the Court, and any

confidentiality agreement consistent with the Protective Order as deemed necessary by the parties; *provided, however*, that nothing shall restrict the Monitor from providing any information to the Court and the parties consistent with the terms of the Protective Order; and

- f. promptly seek an order requiring compliance or such other remedies as may be appropriate under the circumstances should the Company not comply with this injunction.

## 5. **Disputes Regarding Compliance**

- a. If an Attorney General should have a reasonable basis to believe the Company is not in compliance with the terms of this injunction, the Attorney General shall notify the Company, via the Company's General Counsel, in writing of the specific objection, including identifying the provisions of this injunction that the practice appears to violate, and give the Company thirty (30) days to respond to the notification and cure the conduct at issue, if necessary.
- b. The Attorney General shall provide notification to the Monitor at the same time as notification is provided to the Company. To the extent that the Company fails to cure the alleged conduct within the thirty (30) day period, the Monitor shall have ten (10) days to determine the appropriate action and response. After that ten (10) day period and unless otherwise ordered by the Monitor or Bankruptcy Court, any Attorney General may petition the Bankruptcy Court to enforce the terms of this injunction and/or to obtain any remedy as a result of alleged non-compliance with the Company.

### **I. Initial Covered Sackler Persons**

- c. The Initial Covered Sackler Persons shall not actively engage in the opioid business in the United States (other than by virtue of their ownership of beneficial interests in the Company), and shall not take any action that would interfere with the Company's compliance with its obligations under this injunction.

**Appendix II**

**Form of Withdrawal Notice**

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

**In re:**

**PURDUE PHARMA L.P., et al.,**

**Debtors.<sup>4</sup>**

**Chapter 11**

**Case No. 19-23649 (RDD)**

**(Jointly Administered)**

**NOTICE OF WITHDRAWAL FROM THE PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

By this notice of withdrawal (this “**Withdrawal Notice**”), [NAME OF PARTY] hereby provides notice of its withdrawal from voluntary compliance with the terms of the *Eighth Amended Order Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 105(a) Granting Motion for a Preliminary Injunction* [Docket No. ●] (the “**Preliminary Injunction Order**”), effective upon entry of the amended order (the “**Amended Order**”) involuntarily binding [NAME OF PARTY] to the terms of such Amended Order until and including October 5, 2020.

[NAME OF PARTY]

By: \_\_\_\_\_

<sup>4</sup> The Debtors in these cases, along with the last four digits of each Debtor’s registration number in the applicable jurisdiction, are as follows: Purdue Pharma L.P. (7484), Purdue Pharma Inc. (7486), Purdue Transdermal Technologies L.P. (1868), Purdue Pharma Manufacturing L.P. (3821), Purdue Pharmaceuticals L.P. (0034), Imbrium Therapeutics L.P. (8810), Adlon Therapeutics L.P. (6745), Greenfield BioVentures L.P. (6150), Seven Seas Hill Corp. (4591), Ophir Green Corp. (4594), Purdue Pharma of Puerto Rico (3925), Avrio Health L.P. (4140), Purdue Pharmaceutical Products L.P. (3902), Purdue Neuroscience Company (4712), Nayatt Cove Lifescience Inc. (7805), Button Land L.P. (7502), Rhodes Associates L.P. (N/A), Paul Land Inc. (7425), Quidnick Land L.P. (7584), Rhodes Pharmaceuticals L.P. (6166), Rhodes Technologies (7143), UDF LP (0495), SVC Pharma LP (5717) and SVC Pharma Inc. (4014). The Debtors’ corporate headquarters is located at One Stamford Forum, 201 Tresser Boulevard, Stamford, CT 06901.

**Appendix III**

**Chart of Governmental Actions**

	Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Name	Court / Case Number
<i>State Actions</i>					
1.	AG	Alabama	The State of Alabama	The State of Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Cir. Ct. Montgomery Cnty. 03-CV-2019-901174
2.	AG	Alaska	State of Alaska	State of Alaska v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Super. Ct. AK, 3rd Jud. Dist. 3AN-17-09966
3.	AG	Arizona	State of Arizona, ex rel. Mark Brnovich, Attorney General	State of Arizona, ex rel. Mark Brnovich, Attorney General v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Super. Ct. Pima Cnty. C2019-02471
4.	AG	Arizona	State of Arizona, ex rel. Mark Brnovich, Attorney General	State of Arizona, ex rel. Mark Brnovich, Attorney General v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	U.S. Supreme Court No. 19-0151
5.	AG	Arkansas	State of Arkansas, ex rel. Leslie Rutledge	State of Arkansas, ex rel. Leslie Rutledge v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Ct. Pulaski Cnty. 18-2018
6.	AG	California	The People of the State of California	The People of the State of California v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Los Angeles Cnty. Super. Ct. 19-157-V19045
7.	AG	Colorado	The State of Colorado ex rel. Philip J. Weiser, Attorney General	The State of Colorado ex rel. Phil Weiser, Attorney General v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Dist. Ct. Denver 2019CV33300
8.	AG	Connecticut	State of Connecticut	State of Connecticut v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Hartford State Super. Ct. No. 19-07 HHD-CV-19-6105325-S
9.	AG	DC	District of Columbia	District of Columbia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Super. Ct. District of Columbia 2019CA 003680 B
10.	AG	Delaware	State of Delaware, ex rel. Kathy Jennings	State of Delaware, ex rel. Kathy Jennings v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Super. Ct. of Delaware Case No. N18C-01-223 MMJ (2019)
11.	AG	Florida	State of Florida, Office of the Attorney General, Department of Legal Affairs	State of Florida, Office of the Attorney General, Department of Legal Affairs v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Circuit Ct. Pasco Cnty. Case No. 2018-CA-001438
12.	AG	Georgia	State of Georgia	State of Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Super. Ct. Gwinnett Cnty. 19-A-00060-4
13.	AG	Guam	Territory of Guam	Territory of Guam v. Purdue Pharma, L.P., et al.	Super. Ct. Guam, Hagatna CV-19-019













	Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Name	Court / Case Number
			County of Pike; County of Poinsett; County of Polk; County of Pope; County of Prairie; County of Randolph; County of St. Francis; County of Saline; County of Scott; County of Searcy; County of Sebastian; County of Sevier; County of Sharp; County of Stone; County of Union; County of Van Buren; County of Washington; County of White; County of Woodruff; County of Yell		<del>19-02289-9 et al</del> D D004 73 75 Filed 11/14/20 Preliminary Injunction No. 19-02289-9 et al
64.	Municipality	California	City of El Monte, and The People of the State of California, by and through El Monte City Attorney Rick Olivarez	City of El Monte, and The People of the State of California, by and through El Monte City Attorney Rick Olivarez v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	El Monte County Super. Ct. 19-02289-9 V10532

19-02289-9 et al D D004 73 75 Filed 11/14/20  
 Preliminary Injunction No. 19-02289-9 et al  
 Pg 36 of 275



	Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Name	Court / Case Number
68.	Municipality	Connecticut	The City of Ansonia; The City of Danbury; The City of Derby; The City of Norwalk	The City of Ansonia, The City of Danbury, The City of Derby, and The City of Norwalk v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Hartford State Super. Ct. HHD-CV-18-6098036-S
69.	Municipality	Connecticut	City of New Britain	City of New Britain v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Hartford State Super. Ct. HHD-CV-18-6087132-S
70.	Municipality	Connecticut	The Borough of Naugatuck; The City of Bridgeport; The City of Bristol; The City of Milford; The City of Shelton; The City of Torrington; The City of West Haven; The Town of Beacon Falls; The Town of East Hartford; The Town of Fairfield; The Town of Newtown; The Town of North Haven; The Town of Oxford; The Town of Southbury; The Town of Southington; The Town of Thomaston; The Town of Tolland' The Town of Woodbury	The City of Bridgeport, et al. v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Hartford State Super. Ct. HHD-CV-18-6088462-S
71.	Municipality	Connecticut	The City of New Haven	The City of New Haven v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Hartford State Super. Ct. HHD-CV-17-6086134-S
72.	Municipality	Connecticut	The City of New London	The City of New London v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Hartford State Super. Ct. HHD-CV-18-6094421-S
73.	Municipality	Connecticut	The City of Waterbury	The City of Waterbury v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Hartford State Super. Ct. HHD-CV-17-6088121-S

150922899eddd D00d 73 75 Filed 04/02/20 11:50:58 AM  
 Preliminary Injunction and Order of Appointment  
 Pg 38 of 275









	Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Name	Court / Case Number
113.	Municipality	Massachusetts	City of Salem	City of Salem v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Super. Ct. Essex Cnty. 1899CV01767A
114.	Municipality	Massachusetts	City of Worcester	City of Worcester v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Super. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. No. 1984CV00543
115.	Municipality	Massachusetts	Town of Canton	Town of Canton v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Super. Ct. Norfolk Cnty. 18-1582
116.	Municipality	Massachusetts	Town of Lynnfield	Town of Lynnfield v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Super. Ct. Essex Cnty. 1899CV01769D
117.	Municipality	Massachusetts	Town of Natick	Town of Natick v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Super. Ct. Middlesex Cnty. 19-600
118.	Municipality	Massachusetts	Town of Randolph	Town of Randolph v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Super. Ct. Norfolk Cnty. 1987CV00400
119.	Municipality	Massachusetts	Town of Springfield	Town of Springfield v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Super. Ct. Hampden Cnty. 18-59
120.	Municipality	Massachusetts	Town of Wakefield	Town of Wakefield v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Super. Ct. Middlesex Cnty. 18-318
121.	Municipality	Missouri	Butler County; Cape Girardeau County; Christian County; City of Independence; City of Joplin; Crawford County; Dent County; Dunklin County; Franklin County; Greene County; Iron County; Jasper County; Jefferson County; Madison County; Perry County; Ste. Genevieve County; Stone County; Taney County; Texas County; Washington County	Jefferson County, et al. v. Dannie E. Williams, M.D., et al.	2 <sup>nd</sup> Judicial Cir. Ct., St. Louis City 18-0000203
122.	Municipality	Missouri	Polk County, Missouri	Polk County, Missouri v. Allergan PLC, et al.	Ct. Polk Cnty. 18-00011660

Filed Pursuant to Protective Order in Case No. 18-0000203  
 Injunction and/or Injunction  
 Pg 43 of 275  
 11/15/2020 10:58 AM  
 Main Exhibit



	Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Name	Court / Case Number
			Village of Floral Park, NY; Village of Garden City, NY; Village of Greenport, NY; Town of Haverstraw, NY; Town of Hempstead, NY; Town of Huntington, NY; Village of Island Park, NY; Village of Islandia, NY; Town of Islip, NY; Village of Lake Grove, NY; Village of Lawrence, NY; Village of Lindenhurst, NY; Village of Lloyd Harbor, NY; City of Long Beach, NY; Village of Lynbrook, NY; Village of Massapequa Park, NY; Village of Mill Neck, NY; Village of Millerton, NY; Village of New Hyde Park, NY; Village of Nissequoge, NY; Town of North Hempstead, NY; Village of Northport, NY; Village of Old Westbury, NY; Town of Orangetown, NY; Town of Oyster Bay, NY; Borough of Paramus, NJ; Village of Patchogue, NY; Pierce County, GA; City of Pooler, GA; Village of Poquott, NY; Village of Port Washington North, NY; City of Richmond Hill, GA; Town of Riverhead, NY; Village of Saltaire, NY; Town of Smithtown, NY; Town of Southampton, NY; Town of Southold, NY;		19-02289-9 et al v DDD 19 75 Filed 10/14/20 Entered 10/14/20 15:08:58 in Eastern District of NY Preliminary Injunction and Motion for Preliminary Injunction Pg 45 of 275



	Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Name	Court / Case Number
144.	Municipality	New York	The County of Clinton	The County of Clinton v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty 400003/2018
145.	Municipality	New York	County of Columbia	County of Columbia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400015/2018
146.	Municipality	New York	The County of Cortland	The County of Cortland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400019/2018
147.	Municipality	New York	County of Dutchess	County of Dutchess v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400025/2017
148.	Municipality	New York	County of Erie	County of Erie v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400028/2017
149.	Municipality	New York	The County of Essex	The County of Essex v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty 400029/2019
150.	Municipality	New York	The County of Franklin	The County of Franklin v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty 400032/2018
151.	Municipality	New York	The County of Fulton	The County of Fulton v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400038/2018
152.	Municipality	New York	The County of Genesee	The County of Genesee v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400041/2018
153.	Municipality	New York	The County of Greene	The County of Greene v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400048/2018
154.	Municipality	New York	The County of Hamilton	The County of Hamilton v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty 400051/2018
155.	Municipality	New York	County of Herkimer	County of Herkimer v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400053/2019
156.	Municipality	New York	The County of Lewis	The County of Lewis v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400057/2019
157.	Municipality	New York	The County of Livingston	The County of Livingston v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400063/2018
158.	Municipality	New York	The County of Madison	The County of Madison v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400068/2019
159.	Municipality	New York	The County of Monroe	The County of Monroe v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400067/2018
160.	Municipality	New York	County of Montgomery	County of Montgomery v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400069/2019
161.	Municipality	New York	County of Nassau	County of Nassau v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400078/2017

Case No. 19-cv-00001-UNA Document 1-1 Filed 01/15/19 Page 17 of 275

	Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Name	Court / Case Number
162.	Municipality	New York	County of Niagara	County of Niagara v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400012/2017
163.	Municipality	New York	The County of Ontario	The County of Ontario v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400001/2019
164.	Municipality	New York	County of Orange	County of Orange v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400004/2017
165.	Municipality	New York	County of Oswego	County of Oswego v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400007/2018
166.	Municipality	New York	The County of Otsego	The County of Otsego v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400004/2019
167.	Municipality	New York	The County of Putnam	The County of Putnam v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400004/2019
168.	Municipality	New York	County of Rensselaer	County of Rensselaer v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400001/2017
169.	Municipality	New York	County of St. Lawrence	County of St. Lawrence v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400002/2019
170.	Municipality	New York	County of Saratoga	County of Saratoga v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty 400009/2018
171.	Municipality	New York	County of Schenectady	County of Schenectady v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400009/2017
172.	Municipality	New York	County of Schoharie	County of Schoharie v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400009/2017
173.	Municipality	New York	The County of Schuyler	The County of Schuyler v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400004/2018
174.	Municipality	New York	County of Seneca	County of Seneca v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400006/2017
175.	Municipality	New York	The County of Steuben	The County of Steuben v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty 400004/2018
176.	Municipality	New York	County of Suffolk	County of Suffolk v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400001/2017
177.	Municipality	New York	County of Sullivan	County of Sullivan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400007/2017
178.	Municipality	New York	The County of Tioga	The County of Tioga v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400002/2019
179.	Municipality	New York	County of Tompkins	County of Tompkins v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty 400001/2018

Case No. 15-CV-00001-UNA Document 1-1 Filed 05/20/19 Page 15 of 275



	Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Name	Court / Case Number
194.	Municipality	Oklahoma	Board of County Commissioners of Hughes County	Board of County Commissioners of Hughes County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	D. Ct. Hughes Cnty. CJ-2019-36
195.	Municipality	Oklahoma	Board of County Commissioners of McCurtain County	Board of County Commissioners of McCurtain County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	D. Ct. McCurtain Cnty. CJ-2019-54
196.	Municipality	Oklahoma	Board of County Commissioners of Noble County	Board of County Commissioners of Noble County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	D. Ct. Noble Cnty. CJ-2019-05
197.	Municipality	Oklahoma	City of Burns Flat	City of Burns Flat v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	D. Ct. Washita Cnty. CJ-2019-29
198.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	Bedford County	Bedford County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Ct. Bedford Cnty. 18-0120
199.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	Wampum Borough	Wampum Borough v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Ct. Philadelphia Cnty. Jan. Term 2018 No. 01963
200.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	City of Lock Haven	City of Lock Haven v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Ct. Clinton Cnty. 18-0108
201.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	City of Philadelphia	City of Philadelphia v. Allergan PLC, et al.	Ct. Philadelphia Jan. Term 2018, No. 002718
202.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	City of Pittsburgh	City of Philadelphia v. Allergan PLC, et al.	Ct. Allegheny Cnty. 18-01153
203.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	Commonwealth of PA, acting by and through Philadelphia District Attorney Lawrence S. Krasner	Commonwealth of PA, acting by and through Philadelphia District Attorney Lawrence S. Krasner v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Ct. Delaware Cnty. CJ-2017-008095 Rt. Ct. Com. Pl. July Term 2018, No. 05594
204.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	Commonwealth of PA, acting by James Martin; People of Lehigh County and Lehigh County, PA	Commonwealth of PA, acting by James Martin; People of Lehigh County and Lehigh County, PA v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Ct. Lehigh Cnty. 2018-0716

19-02289-9-0111  
 Plaintiff's Motion for  
 Summary Judgment  
 Filed 04/02/20  
 Pg 50 of 275



	Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Name	Court / Case Number
214.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	Bucks County	Bucks County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Bucks Cnty. No. 2018-03144
215.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	Cambria County, Pennsylvania	Cambria County, Pennsylvania v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Cambria Cnty 2017-4131
216.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	County of Carbon	County of Carbon v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Carbon Cnty. No. 18-0990
217.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	County of Clarion	County of Clarion v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Clarion Cnty. 285-D-2018
218.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	Clearfield County	Clearfield County, Pennsylvania v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Clearfield Cnty. 2018-0484-CD
219.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	Clinton County	Clinton County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Clinton Cnty. 752-D-0000
220.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	County of Cumberland	County of Cumberland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Cumberland Cnty. 2018-02147
221.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	Dauphin County, PA	Dauphin County, PA v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Dauphin Cnty. 2018-CV-716-CV
222.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	Delaware County	Delaware County, Pennsylvania v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Delaware Cnty. No. 17-008095
223.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	County of Erie	County of Erie v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Erie Cnty. 18-00018
224.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	County of Fayette	County of Fayette v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Fayette Cnty. 2018-0676
225.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	Franklin County	Franklin County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Franklin Cnty. 2018-0445
226.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	County of Greene	County of Greene v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Greene Cnty. 718-00017
227.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	Lackawanna County, Pennsylvania	Lackawanna County, Pennsylvania v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Lackawanna Cnty. 18-05156
228.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	Lawrence County, Pennsylvania	Lawrence County, Pennsylvania v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Leaver Cnty 18-002017
229.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	Mercer County	Mercer County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Mercer Cnty. 2018-0596
230.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	People of Northampton County and Northampton County, PA	People of Northampton County and Northampton County, PA v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Northampton Cnty. 2018-01557

10025099.pdf  
 Filed 08/27/20  
 Entered 08/27/20 15:08:58  
 Eastern District of Pennsylvania  
 Page 52 of 275

	Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Name	Court / Case Number
231.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	Pike County, Pa.	Pike County, Pa. v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Pike Cnty. No. 602-2018
232.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	Schuylkill County, Pennsylvania	Schuylkill County, Pa. v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Schuylkill Cnty. S-1241-18
233.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	County of Monroe	County of Monroe v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Monroe Cnty. 3972-CV-18
234.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	County of Tioga	County of Tioga v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Tioga Cnty. 563-CV-2018
235.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	County of Washington	County of Washington v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Washington Cnty. 2017-0268
236.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	County of Westmoreland	County of Westmoreland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Westmoreland Cnty 2017-0975
237.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	County of York	County of York v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. York Cnty. 2017-03372
238.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	The Municipality of Norristown and The Township of West Norriton	The Municipality of Norristown and The Township of West Norriton v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Montgomery Cnty. 2017-02178
239.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	Mahoning Township	Mahoning Township v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Philadelphia Cnty. 1200-03466
240.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	Newtown Township	Newtown Township v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Bucks Cnty. 2017-03043
241.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	Warrington Township	Warrington Township v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Bucks Cnty. 2017-04956
242.	Municipality	South Carolina	City of Charleston	City of Charleston v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Charleston Cnty. 2010-CP-10-04294
243.	Municipality	South Carolina	City of North Charleston	City of North Charleston v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Charleston Cnty. 2010-CP-10-03978
244.	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Abbeville	County of Abbeville v. Rite Aid of South Carolina Inc., et al.	C.P. Abbeville Cnty. 2010-CP-01-00154
245.	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Aiken	County of Aiken v. Rite Aid of South Carolina Inc., et al.	C.P. Aiken Cnty. 2010-CP-02-01086
246.	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Allendale	County of Allendale v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Allendale Cnty. 2010-CP-03-00125
247.	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Anderson	County of Anderson v. Rite Aid of South Carolina Inc., et al.	C.P. Anderson Cnty. 2010-CP-04-01108

15-03-2018 15:08:58  
 Exhibit  
 of 275

	Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Name	Court / Case Number
248.	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Bamberg	County of Bamberg v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Bamberg Cnty. 2018-CP-05-00189
249.	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Barnwell	County of Barnwell v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Barnwell Cnty. 2018-CP-06-00329
250.	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Beaufort	County of Beaufort v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Beaufort Cnty. 2018-CP-07-01245
251.	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Calhoun	County of Calhoun v. Rite Aid of South Carolina Inc., et al.	C.P. Calhoun Cnty. 2018-CP-09-00065
252.	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Cherokee	County of Cherokee v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.	C.P. Cherokee Cnty. 2018-CP-11-00503
253.	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Chesterfield	County of Chesterfield v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.	C.P. Chesterfield Cnty. 2018-CP-13-00410
254.	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Clarendon	County of Clarendon v. Rite Aid of South Carolina Inc., et al.	C.P. Clarendon Cnty. 2018-CP-14-00236
255.	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Colleton	County of Colleton v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Colleton Cnty. 2018-CP-15-00438
256.	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Dillon	County of Dillon v. Rite Aid of South Carolina Inc., et al.	C.P. Dillon Cnty. 2018-CP-17-00213
257.	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Dorchester	County of Dorchester v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Dorchester Cnty. 2018-CP-18-01122
258.	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Edgefield	County of Edgefield v. Rite Aid of South Carolina Inc., et al.	C.P. Edgefield Cnty. 2018-CP-19-00120
259.	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Fairfield	County of Fairfield v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.	C.P. Fairfield Cnty. 2018-CP-20-00272
260.	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Florence	County of Florence v. Rite Aid of South Carolina Inc., et al.	C.P. Florence Cnty. 2018-CP-21-01213
261.	Municipality	South Carolina	Greenville County	Greenville County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Greenville Cnty. 2018-CP-23-01294
262.	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Greenwood	County of Greenwood v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.	C.P. Cherokee Cnty. 2018-CP-24-00775
263.	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Hampton	County of Hampton v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Hampton Cnty. 2018-CP-25-00258
264.	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Horry	County of Horry v. Rite Aid of South Carolina Inc., et al.	C.P. Horry Cnty. 2018-CP-26-02684

10/22/2021 10:50:58 AM in Exhibit  
 Document ID: 15791  
 Page 54 of 275





	Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Name	Court / Case Number
			<p>including Bedord County, Town of Bell Buckle, Town of Normandy, City of Shelbyville, Town of Wartrace, Lincoln County, City of Ardmore, City of Fayetteville, Town of Petersburg, Marshall County, Town of Chapel Hill, Town of Cornersville, City of Lewisburg, Moore County, City of Lynchburg;</p> <p>Brent A. Cooper, in his official capacity as the District Attorney General for the Twenty-Second Judicial District, TN and on behalf of all political subdivisions therein, including Giles County, City of Elkton, Town of Lynnville, City of Minor Hill, City of Pulaski, Lawrence County, Town of Ethridge, City of Iron City, City of Lawrenceburg, City of Loretto, City of St. Joseph, Maury County, City of Columbia, City of Mount Pleasant, City of Spring Hill, Wayne County, City of Clifton, City of Collinwood, City of Waynesboro;</p> <p>Lisa S. Zavogiannis, in her official capacity as the District Attorney General for the Thirty-First Judicial District, TN and on behalf of all political subdivisions therein, including Van Buren County, Town of Spencer, Warren County, Town of Centertown, City of McMinnville, Town of Morrison,</p>		<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);"> 19-02289-9 et al v D Dood 73 75 Filed 04/02/20 Entered 04/02/20 15:08:58 in Exhibit  Preliminary Injunction and Substantive Injunction Pg 57 of 275 </p>

	Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Name	Court / Case Number
			Town of Viola;  Baby Doe, by and through his Mother.		
284.	District Attorney General / Municipality	Tennessee	Jared Effler, in his official capacity as the District Attorney General for the Eighth Judicial District, TN;  Charme Allen, in her official capacity as the District Attorney General for the Sixth Judicial District; Dave Clark, in his official capacity as the District Attorney General for the Seventh Judicial District, TN;  Russell Johnson, in his official capacity as the District Attorney General for the Ninth Judicial District, TN;  Stephen Crump, in his official capacity as the District Attorney General for the Tenth Judicial District, TN;  Jimmy Dunn, in his official capacity as the District Attorney General for the Fourth Judicial District, TN;  Mike Taylor, in his official capacity as the District Attorney General for the Twelfth Judicial District, TN  Baby Doe #1; Baby Doe #2	Jared Effler, et al. v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Eastern Section at Knoxville Court of Appeals No. 18-01994-COA-R3-CV  FILED DOUGLAS Preliminary Injunction and Stay of Injunction Pg 58 of 275

FILED  
DOUGLAS  
Preliminary Injunction and Stay of Injunction  
Pg 58 of 275



	Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Name	Court / Case Number
294.	Municipality	Texas	County of Coryell	County of Coryell v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Coryell Cnty. Dist. Ct. 2018-77097
295.	Municipality	Texas	County of Dallas	County of Dallas v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Harris Cnty. Dist. Ct. 2018-77098
296.	Municipality	Texas	County of Delta	County of Delta v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corp., et al.	Harris Cnty. Dist. Ct. 2018-77104
297.	Municipality	Texas	County of Dimmit	County of Dimmit v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Harris Cnty. Dist. Ct. 2018-76933
298.	Municipality	Texas	County of Ector	County of Ector v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Harris Cnty. Dist. Ct. 2018-76934
299.	Municipality	Texas	County of El Paso	County of El Paso v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Harris Cnty. Dist. Ct. 2018-76970
300.	Municipality	Texas	County of Falls	County of Falls v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Harris Cnty. Dist. Ct. 2018-77106
301.	Municipality	Texas	County of Fannin	County of Fannin v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Harris Cnty. Dist. Ct. 2018-76974
302.	Municipality	Texas	County of Grayson	County of Grayson v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Harris Cnty. Dist. Ct. 2018-76994
303.	Municipality	Texas	County of Harrison	County of Harrison v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Harris Cnty. Dist. Ct. 2018-77108
304.	Municipality	Texas	County of Hidalgo	County of Hidalgo v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Harris Cnty. Dist. Ct. 2018-77109
305.	Municipality	Texas	County of Hopkins	County of Hopkins v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Harris Cnty. Dist. Ct. 2018-77111
306.	Municipality	Texas	County of Houston	County of Houston v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Harris Cnty. Dist. Ct. 2018-77021
307.	Municipality	Texas	Johnson County	Johnson County v. Purdue Pharma, L.P. et al.	Harris Cnty. Dist. Ct. 2018-77346
308.	Municipality	Texas	County of Kendall	County of Kendall v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Harris Cnty. Dist. Ct. 2018-77023
309.	Municipality	Texas	County of Kerr	County of Kerr v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Harris Cnty. Dist. Ct. 2018-77114
310.	Municipality	Texas	County of Liberty	County of Liberty v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Harris Cnty. Dist. Ct. 2018-77116
311.	Municipality	Texas	County of Limestone	County of Limestone v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Harris Cnty. Dist. Ct. 2018-77025

19-08-2024 09:07:07 AM in Exhibit







	Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Name	Court / Case Number
349.	Municipality	West Virginia	The County Commission of Mason County; The County Commission of Barbour County; Mayor Chris Tatum on behalf of The Village of Barboursville; The County Commission of Taylor County; The County Commission of Webster County; Mayor Don E. McCourt, on behalf of the Town of Addison a/k/a The Town of Webster Springs	The County Commission of Mason County; The County Commission of Barbour County; Mayor Chris Tatum on behalf of The Village of Barboursville; The County Commission of Taylor County; The County Commission of Webster County; and Mayor Don E. McCourt, on behalf of the Town of Addison a/k/a The Town of Webster Springs v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.  Consolidated before MLP In re Opioid Litigation	Cir. Ct. Marshall County 19-C-4H 19-C-5H 19-C-6H 19-C-7H 19-C-8H 19-C-9H  Cir. Ct. Kanawha County 19-C-000
350.	Municipality	West Virginia	Mayor Peggy Knotts Barney, on behalf of the City of Grafton; Mayor Philip Bowers, on behalf of the City of Philippi	Mayor Peggy Knotts Barney, on behalf of the City of Grafton, and Mayor Philip Bowers, on behalf of the City of Philippi v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.  Consolidated before MLP In re Opioid Litigation	Cir. Ct. Marshall Cnty. 19-C-051 19-C-052  Cir. Ct. Kanawha County 19-C-000
351.	Municipality	West Virginia	Monongalia County Commission; Marion County Commission; Doddridge County Commission; Randolph County Commission; and Upshur County Commission	Monongalia County Commission; Marion County Commission; Doddridge County Commission; Randolph County Commission; and Upshur County Commission v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.  Consolidated before MLP In re Opioid Litigation	Cir. Ct. Marshall Cnty. 19-C-022H 19-C-033H 19-C-034H 19-C-035H 19-C-036H  Cir. Ct. Kanawha County 19-C-000

Preliminary Injunction at 1507 of 275  
 Filed 07/20/20  
 Doc 1-1  
 Page 64 of 275

	Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Name	Court / Case Number
352.	Municipality	West Virginia	Roane County Commission; The City of Spencer; Jackson County Commission; The City of Ripley; The Town of Ravenswood; Wood County Commission; The City of Williamstown; Wirt County Commission; The Town of Elizabeth; Pleasants County Commission; City of St. Mary's; Ritchie County Commission; Town of Harrisville	Roane County Commission; The City of Spencer; Jackson County Commission; The City of Ripley; The Town of Ravenswood; Wood County Commission; The City of Williamstown; Wirt County Commission; The Town of Elizabeth; Pleasants County Commission; City of St. Mary's; Ritchie County Commission; Town of Harrisville v. Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc., et al.  Consolidated before MLP In re Opioid Litigation	Cir. Ct. Marshall Cnty. 19-C-96H 19-C-108H  19-02289-96H Preliminary Injunctive Relief Case No. 17- md-2804  Cir. Ct. Kanawha County 19-C-000
<b>Local Government (MDL)</b>					
353.	Municipality	MDL	Broward County, Florida	Broward County, Florida v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	North Ohio 1:18-md-05332 Mason Case No. 17-md-2804
354.	Municipality	MDL	Cabell County Commission; City of Huntington, West Virginia	Cabell County Commission and City of Huntington, West Virginia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corp., et al.	North Ohio. 1:18-md-04503 (Cabell) 1:18-md-04504 (Huntington) Mason Case No. 17-md-2804
355.	Municipality	MDL	City of Chicago	City of Chicago v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	North Ohio 1:18-md-045169 Mason Case No. 17-md-2804
356.	Municipality	MDL	City of Cleveland	City of Cleveland v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corp., et al.	North Ohio 1:18-md-045132 Mason Case No. 17-md-2804
357.	Municipality	MDL	City of Dothan, Alabama	City of Dothan, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	North Ohio 1:19-md-045886 Mason Case No. 17-md-2804

19-02289-96H Preliminary Injunctive Relief Case No. 17-md-2804

	Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Name	Court / Case Number
358.	Municipality	MDL	City of Henderson, Kentucky	City of Henderson, Kentucky, on behalf of themselves and all other similarly situated home rule cities v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Ohio 1:20-op-45062 Master Case No. 17-md-2804
359.	Municipality	MDL	City of Stuart, Florida	City of Stuart, Florida v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Ohio 1:20-op-45124 Master Case No. 17-md-2804
360.	Municipality	MDL	Clinton County, Missouri	Clinton County, Missouri v. Allergan PLC, et al.	N.D. Ohio 1:20-op-45130 Master Case No. 17-md-2804
361.	Municipality	MDL	County of Alameda; City of Costa Mesa; City of Anaheim; City of Santa Ana; City of San Clemente; City of Encinitas; City of La Habra; City of La Mesa; City of Oxnard; City of Placentia; The People of the State of California, by and through Alameda County Counsel Donna Ziegler, Costa Mesa City Attorney Kimberly Hall Barlow, and Anaheim City Attorney Robert Fabela, Santa Ana City Attorney Sonia R. Carvalho, San Clemente City Attorney Scott C. Smith, Encinitas City Attorney Leslie Devaney, La Habra City Attorney Richard D. Jones, La Mesa City Attorney Glenn Sabine, Oxnard City Attorney Stephen Fischer, and Placentia City Attorney Christian Bettenhausen	County of Alameda, et al. v. Richard Sackler, et al.	N.D. Ohio 1:20-op-45055 Master Case No. 17-md-2804 Preliminary Injunction and Stay of Injunction

1:20-op-45055-1-1 Filed 01/20/20 Entered 01/20/20 15:08:58 in Exhibit  
 Pg 66 of 275







	Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Name	Court / Case Number
399.	Municipality	California	City of Fullerton and the People of the State of California by and through Fullerton City Attorney Richard D. Jones	City of Fullerton and the People of the State of California by and through Fullerton City Attorney Richard D. Jones v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Cal. 3:19-cv-02321
400.	Municipality	California	City of Irvine and the People of the State of California by and through Irvine City Attorney Jeffrey Melching	City of Irvine and the People of the State of California by and through Irvine City Attorney Jeffrey Melching v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Cal. 3:19-cv-02323
401.	Municipality	California	City of San Clemente and the People of the State of California by and through San Clemente City Attorney Scott C. Smith	City of San Clemente and the People of the State of California, by and through San Clemente City Attorney Scott C. Smith v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Cal. 4:19-cv-02326
402.	Municipality	California	City of Costa Mesa and the People of the State of California by and through Costa Mesa City Attorney Kimberly Hall Barlow	City of Costa Mesa and the People of the State of California by and through Costa Mesa City Attorney Kimberly Hall Barlow v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Cal. 4:19-cv-02320
403.	Municipality	California	City of Westminster and the People of the State of California by and through Westminster City Attorney Richard D. Jones	City of Westminster and the People of the State of California by and through Westminster City Attorney Richard D. Jones v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Cal. 3:19-cv-02325
404.	Municipality	California	County of Alameda and the People of the State of California by and through County Counsel Donna Ziegler	County of Alameda and the People of the State of California by and through County Counsel Donna Ziegler v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Cal. 3:19-cv-02307
405.	Municipality	California	The City and County of San Francisco, California and the People of the State of California, acting by and through San Francisco City Attorney Dennis J. Herrera	The City and County of San Francisco, California and the People of the State of California, acting by and through San Francisco City Attorney Dennis J. Herrera v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Cal. 3:18-cv-07591

1902289  
 Filed 10/20/20  
 Preliminary Injunction  
 Docket 19-511  
 Filed 10/20/20  
 Preliminary Injunction  
 Pg 70 of 275

	Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Name	Court / Case Number
406.	Municipality	Delaware	City of Dover, a municipal corporation of the State of Delaware; City of Seaford, a municipal corporation of the State of Delaware; Kent County, a political subdivision of the State of Delaware	City of Dover, a municipal corporation of the State of Delaware; City of Seaford, a municipal corporation of the State of Delaware; and Kent County, a political subdivision of the State of Delaware v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	D. Del. 1:19-cv-00581
407.	Municipality	Florida	City of Ocala, Florida	City of Ocala, Florida v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	M.D. Fla. 5:19-cv-00440
408.	Municipality	Hawaii	County of Hawai'i	County of Hawai'i v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	D. Hawaii 1:19-cv-00581
409.	Municipality / Class Action	Hawaii	County of Kaua'i, a political subdivision of the State of Hawaii, for themselves individually, and on behalf of all similarly situated persons, and on behalf of the general public, as a class	County of Kaua'i, a political subdivision of the State of Hawaii, for themselves individually, and on behalf of all similarly situated persons, and on behalf of the general public, as a class v. CVS Health Corporation, et al.	D. Hawaii 1:19-cv-00377
410.	Municipality	Louisiana	Town of Abita Springs, Louisiana	Town of Abita Springs, Louisiana v. Purdue Pharma Inc., et al.	E.D. La. 2:19-cv-14521
411.	Municipality	Louisiana	Warren Montgomery, Duly Elected 22nd Judicial District Attorney for the Parishes of St. Tammany and Washington	Warren Montgomery, Duly Elected 22nd Judicial District Attorney for the Parishes of St. Tammany and Washington v. Purdue Pharma Inc., et al.	E.D. La. 2:19-cv-14516
412.	Municipality	Maine	City of Rockland, State of Maine	City of Rockland, State of Maine v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	D. Me. 2:19-cv-00373
413.	Municipality	Maine	Knox County, State of Maine	Knox County, State of Maine, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	D. Me. 2:19-cv-00371
414.	Municipality	Maryland	Howard County	Howard County, Maryland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	D. Md. 1:19-cv-02116

19-02285-9  
 Filed 04/22/20  
 Entered 04/22/20 10:27:41  
 Primary Injunction  
 Page 7 of 275



	Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Name	Court / Case Number
431.	Municipality	New York	City of Rochester	City of Rochester v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	E.D.N.Y. 2:18-cv-03800
432.	Municipality	New York	City of Saratoga Springs	The City of Saratoga Springs v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D.N.Y. 1:19-cv-00789
433.	Municipality	Ohio	The County of Fayette, Ohio; The State of Ohio ex rel. Prosecuting Attorney of Fayette County, Jess Weade	The County of Fayette, Ohio; The State of Ohio ex rel. Prosecuting Attorney of Fayette County, Jess Weade v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	S.D. Ohio 2:19-cv-04347
434.	Municipality	Oklahoma	Board of County Commissioners of Atoka County	Board of County Commissioners of Atoka County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	E.D. Okla. 6:19-cv-00279
435.	Municipality	Oklahoma	Board of County Commissioners of Caddo County	Board of County Commissioners of Caddo County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	E.D. Okla. 5:19-cv-00710
436.	Municipality	Oklahoma	Board of County Commissioners of Cimarron County	Board of County Commissioners of Cimarron County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	E.D. Okla. 5:19-cv-00776
437.	Municipality	Oklahoma	Board of County Commissioners of Coal County	Board of County Commissioners of Coal County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	E.D. Okla. 6:19-cv-00405
438.	Municipality	Oklahoma	Board of County Commissioners of Grady County	Board of County Commissioners of Grady County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	E.D. Okla. 5:19-cv-00703
439.	Municipality	Oklahoma	Board of County Commissioners of Haskell County	Board of County Commissioners of Haskell County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	E.D. Okla. 6:19-cv-00280
440.	Municipality	Oklahoma	Board of County Commissioners of Jackson County	Board of County Commissioners of Jackson County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	E.D. Okla. 5:19-cv-01108

19-02289-990  
 Pretrial  
 Doc 173  
 Filed 04/20/20  
 Entered 04/20/20 1:50:08  
 Pg 73 of 275

	Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Name	Court / Case Number
441.	Municipality	Oklahoma	Board of County Commissioners of Jefferson County	Board of County Commissioners of Jefferson County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	W.D. Okla. 5:19-cv-00721
442.	Municipality	Oklahoma	Board of County Commissioners of Kay County	Board of County Commissioners of Kay County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	W.D. Okla. 5:19-cv-00884
443.	Municipality	Oklahoma	Board of County Commissioners of Latimer County	Board of County Commissioners of Latimer County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	E.D. Okla. 6:19-cv-00282
444.	Municipality	Oklahoma	Board of County Commissioners of LeFlore County	Board of County Commissioners of LeFlore County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	E.D. Okla. 6:19-cv-00362
445.	Municipality	Oklahoma	Board of County Commissioners of Lincoln County	Board of County Commissioners of Lincoln County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	W.D. Okla. 5:19-cv-01109
446.	Municipality	Oklahoma	Board of County Commissioners of Logan County	Board of County Commissioners of Logan County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	W.D. Okla. 5:19-cv-00984
447.	Municipality	Oklahoma	Board of County Commissioners of Love County	Board of County Commissioners of Love County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	E.D. Okla. 6:19-cv-00320
448.	Municipality	Oklahoma	Board of County Commissioners of Major County	Board of County Commissioners of Major County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	W.D. Okla. 5:19-cv-00879
449.	Municipality	Oklahoma	Board of County Commissioners of Okfuskee County	Board of County Commissioners of Okfuskee County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	E.D. Okla. 6:19-cv-00300
450.	Municipality	Oklahoma	Board of County Commissioners of Oklahoma County	Board of County Commissioners of Oklahoma County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	W.D. Okla. 5:19-cv-00926

19-02289-96  
 Addendum  
 Preliminary Injunction and Order of Protection  
 Filed 01/17/20  
 Page 17 of 27  
 19-02289-96  
 Addendum  
 Preliminary Injunction and Order of Protection  
 Filed 01/17/20  
 Page 17 of 27



	Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Name	Court / Case Number
465.	Municipality	Texas	County of Duval	County of Duval v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	S.D. Tex. 4:19-cv-02504
466.	Municipality	Texas	County of Freestone	County of Freestone v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	S.D. Tex. 4:19-cv-03983
467.	Municipality	Texas	Ellis County	Ellis County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	S.D. Tex. 4:19-cv-02256
468.	Municipality	Texas	County of Jim Hogg	County of Jim Hogg v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	S.D. Tex. 4:19-cv-02816
469.	Municipality	Texas	County of Kleberg	County of Kleberg v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	S.D. Tex. 4:19-cv-02815
470.	Municipality	Texas	Rockwall County	Rockwall County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	S.D. Tex. 4:19-cv-02181
471.	Municipality	Texas	County of Williamson	County of Williamson v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	S.D. Tex. 4:19-cv-03299
472.	Municipality	Virginia	Amherst County, Virginia	Amherst County, Virginia v. Mallinckrodt PLC, et al.	W.D. Va. 6:09-cv-00077
473.	Municipality	Virginia	Botetourt County, Virginia	Botetourt County, Virginia v. Mallinckrodt PLC, et al.	W.D. Va. 7:09-cv-00759
474.	Municipality	Virginia	Charlotte County	Charlotte County, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	W.D. Va. 4:09-cv-00029
475.	Municipality	Virginia	City of Emporia	City of Emporia, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	E.D. Va. 3:09-cv-00513
476.	Municipality	Virginia	City of Fredericksburg	City of Fredericksburg, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	E.D. Va. 3:09-cv-00457
477.	Municipality	Virginia	City of Portsmouth	City of Portsmouth v. McKesson Corporation, et al.	E.D. Va. 2:09-cv-00331
478.	Municipality	Virginia	City of Radford	City of Radford v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	W.D. Va. 7:09-cv-00525
479.	Municipality	Virginia	City of Waynesboro	The City of Waynesboro, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	W.D. Va. 5:09-cv-00058
480.	Municipality	Virginia	Culpeper County	Culpeper County, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	W.D. Va. 3:09-cv-00037
481.	Municipality	Virginia	Cumberland County	Cumberland County, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	W.D. Va. 6:09-cv-00054
482.	Municipality	Virginia	Greensville County	Greensville County, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	E.D. Va. 3:09-cv-00459

19-02889-Period Document  
 Plaintiff: Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.  
 Defendant: Plaintiff  
 Filed: 11/13/20  
 Page 1 of 275



**Appendix IV**

**Chart of Related Party Actions**

	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
<b>State Actions</b>						
1.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	AG	Alabama	The State of Alabama	The State of Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Cir. Ct. Montgomery Cnty. 03-CV-2019-901174
2.	The Purdue Frederick Company	AG	Alaska	State of Alaska	State of Alaska v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Super. Ct. AK, 3rd Jud. Dist. 3AN-17-09966
3.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc. (d/b/a The Purdue Frederick Company); Richard Sackler; Theresa Sackler; Kathe Sackler; Jonathan Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Beverly Sackler; David Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt	AG	Arizona	State of Arizona, ex rel. Mark Brnovich, Attorney General	State of Arizona, ex rel. Mark Brnovich, Attorney General v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Super. Ct. Pima Cnty. C20072471
4.	Richard Sackler; Theresa Sackler; Kathe Sackler; Jonathan Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Beverly Sackler; David Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; The Purdue Frederick Company Inc. (d/b/a The Purdue Frederick Company); Purdue Holdings L.P.; PLP Associates Holdings L.P.; BR Holdings Associates L.P.; Rosebay Medical Company L.P.; Beacon Company	AG	Arizona	State of Arizona, ex rel. Mark Brnovich, Attorney General	State of Arizona, ex rel. Mark Brnovich, Attorney General v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	U.S. Supreme Court No. 220151
5.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	AG	Arkansas	State of Arkansas, ex rel. Leslie Rutledge	State of Arkansas, ex rel. Leslie Rutledge v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Cir. Ct. Pulaski Cnty. 60CV-18-2018

11/03/2023 09:01:11 AM  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Injunction  
 Page 79 of 275  
 11/03/2023 09:01:11 AM  
 Error! Unknown document property name.



	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
10.	Richard Sackler; Jonathan Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Theresa Sackler; David Sackler	AG	Delaware	State of Delaware, ex rel. Kathleen Jennings	State of Delaware, ex rel. Kathleen Jennings v. Richard Sackler, et al.	Super. Ct. of Delaware C.A. No. N19C-09-062 MMJ (CCLD)
11.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	AG	Delaware	State of Delaware, ex rel. Kathy Jennings	State of Delaware, ex rel. Kathy Jennings v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Super. Ct. of Delaware C.A. No. N18C-01-223 MMJ (CCLD)
12.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	AG	Florida	State of Florida, Office of the Attorney General, Department of Legal Affairs	State of Florida, Office of the Attorney General, Department of Legal Affairs v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Cir. Ct. Pasco Cnty. Case No. 2018-CA-001438
13.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	AG	Georgia	State of Georgia	State of Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Super. Ct. Gwinnett Cnty. 19-A-00060-4
14.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	AG	Guam	Territory of Guam	Territory of Guam v. Purdue Pharma, L.P., et al.	Super. Ct. Guam, Hagatna CV1020-19
15.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Beverly Sackler; David A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Jonathan Sackler; Kathe Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Theresa Sackler	AG	Hawaii	State of Hawaii, ex rel. Clare E. Connors, Attorney General	State of Hawaii, ex rel. Clare E. Connors, Attorney General v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1st Cir. Ct. of Hawaii 09-1-0862-06 JHA
16.	Richard Sackler; Theresa Sackler; Kathe Sackler; Jonathan Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Beverly Sackler; David Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt	AG	Idaho	State of Idaho, Through Attorney General Lawrence G. Wasden	State of Idaho, Through Attorney General Lawrence G. Wasden v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Ada County District Court CV01-19-10061

19-02289-991  
 Filed 01/03/20  
 Entered 01/03/20 15:08:58  
 Preliminary Injunction and  
 Order of Attachment  
 Pg 81 of 275



	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
24.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler	AG	Maryland	Consumer Protection Division Office of the Attorney General (MD)	Consumer Protection Division Office of the Attorney General v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Consumer Protection Division of the Office of the Attorney General (Md.) / Office of Administrative Hearings CPD Case No.: 311366 OAH Case No. 1923474
25.	Richard Sackler; Theresa Sackler; Kathe Sackler; Jonathan Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Beverly Sackler; David Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Peter Boer; Paulo Costa; Cecil Pickett; Ralph Synderman; Judith Lewent; Craig Landau; John Stewart; Mark Timney; Russell J. Gasdia	AG	Massachusetts	Commonwealth of Massachusetts	Commonwealth of Massachusetts v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Super. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. C.A. No. 1884-cv-01808 (BLS2)
26.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Richard Sackler; Kathe Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Jonathan Sackler; David Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler	AG	Minnesota	State of Minnesota by its Attorney General, Keith Ellison	State of Minnesota by Attorney General, Keith Ellison v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	4th Jud. Dist. Ct., Hennepin Cnty. Court File No. 27-CV-18-10788
27.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	AG	Mississippi	State of Mississippi	State of Mississippi v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Hinds Cnty. 25CH1:15-cv-001814

19-02289-9611  
 Preliminary Injunction and  
 19-02289-9611  
 Filed 02/20/20  
 Page 85 of 275  
 Exhibit



	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
34.	Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Kathe Sackler; Beverly Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler	AG	New Jersey	Gurbir S. Grewal, Attorney General and Paul Rodriguez, Acting Director of the New Jersey Division of Consumer Affairs	Gurbir S. Grewal, et al. v. Richard S. Sackler, et al.	Super. Ct. NJ Chancery. Div., Essex Cty. ESX-C-115-19
35.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	AG	New Mexico	State of New Mexico, ex rel., Hector Balderas, Attorney General	State of New Mexico, ex rel., Hector Balderas, Attorney General v. Purdue Pharm L.P., et al.	Santa Fe Dist. D-101-CV-201702541
36.	Richard S. Sackler; Beverly Sackler; David A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Jonathan D. Sackler; Kathe Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Theresa Sackler	AG	New Mexico	State of New Mexico, ex rel., Hector Balderas, Attorney General	State of New Mexico, ex rel., Hector Balderas, Attorney General v. Richard S. Sackler, et al.	Santa Fe Dist. D-101-CV-201902399
37.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc; The P.F. Laboratories Inc.; Purdue Holdings L.P.; Rosebay Medical Company L.P.; The Beacon Company; PLP Associates Holdings L.P.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler	AG	New York	The People of the State of New York, by Letitia James, Attorney General of the State of New York	The People of the State of New York, by Letitia James, Attorney General of the State of New York v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400016-2018

19-02289-9-01-0054-73-75-Filed 11/02/20 Entered 04/02/20 15:08:58  
 Primary Injunction and Attorney's Fees  
 Pg 85 of 275

	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
38.	Purdue Pharma Technologies Inc.; The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	AG	North Carolina	State of North Carolina, ex rel. Joshua H. Stein, Attorney General	State of North Carolina, ex rel. Joshua H. Stein, Attorney General v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Super. Ct. Wake Cnty. 18-cv-6051
39.	Richard Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Jonathan Sackler; Kathe Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David Sackler	AG	North Carolina	State of North Carolina, ex rel. Joshua H. Stein, Attorney General	State of North Carolina, ex rel. Joshua H. Stein, Attorney General v. Richard Sackler et al.	Super. Ct. Wake Cnty. 19-cv-12596
40.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	AG	North Dakota	State of North Dakota, ex rel. Wayne Stenehjem, Attorney General	State of North Dakota, ex rel. Wayne Stenehjem, Attorney General v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Dist. Ct. Burleigh Cnty. 08-2018-CV-01300
41.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	AG	Ohio	State of Ohio, ex rel. David Yost, Ohio Attorney General	State of Ohio, ex rel. David Yost, Ohio Attorney General v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Ross Cnty 17CI000261
42.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	AG	Oregon	State of Oregon, ex rel. Ellen F. Rosenblum, Attorney General for the State of Oregon	State of Oregon, ex rel. Ellen F. Rosenblum, Attorney General for the State of Oregon v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Cir. Ct. Multnomah Cnty. 18CV40526
43.	Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; David A. Sackler; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler;	AG	Oregon	State of Oregon, ex rel. Ellen F. Rosenblum, Attorney General for the State of Oregon	State of Oregon, ex rel. Ellen F. Rosenblum, Attorney General for the State of Oregon v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Cir. Ct. Multnomah Cnty. 19CV22185

Filed 11/15/20 Entered 11/15/20 15:08:58  
 Plaintiff's Motion for Injunction Pg 86 of 275











	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
76.	Richard Sackler; Theresa Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Beverly Sackler; Kathe Sackler; Jonathan Sackler; David Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt	Municipality	MDL	The County Commissioner of Carroll County Maryland	The County Commissioner of Carroll County Maryland v. Actavis PLC, et al.	N.D. Ohio 1:20-op-45052 Master Case No. 17-md- 2804
77.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	MDL	The County of Cuyahoga, Ohio; State of Ohio ex rel., Prosecuting Attorney of Cuyahoga County, Michael C. O'Malley	The County of Cuyahoga Ohio, and State of Ohio ex rel., Prosecuting Attorney of Cuyahoga County, Mich. C. O'Malley v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Ohio 1:18-op-45332 Master Case No. 17-md- 2804
78.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	MDL	County of Monroe	County of Monroe v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Ohio 1:18-op-45158 Master Case No. 17-md- 2804
79.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	MDL	County of Summit, Ohio; Summit County Public Health; The City of Akron; State of Ohio ex rel., Prosecuting Attorney for Summit County, Sherri Bevan Walsh and the Director of Law for the City of Akron, Eve Belfance	County of Summit, Ohio et al. v. Purdue Pharma L.P. et al.	N.D. Ohio 1:18-op-45090 Master Case No. 17-md- 2804

19-02289-9 Filed 04/02/20 Entered 04/02/20 15:08:58  
 Primary Injunction and Injunction Pg 92 of 275



	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
87.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Alabama	City of Chickasaw, Alabama	City of Chickasaw, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	S.D. Ala. 1:20-cv-00117
88.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Alabama	City of Eufaula, Alabama	City of Eufaula, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	M.D. Ala. 2:19-cv-00862
89.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Alabama	City of Fairfield, Alabama	City of Fairfield, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Ala. 2:20-cv-00202
90.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Alabama	City of Geneva, Alabama	City of Geneva, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	M.D. Ala. 1:19-cv-00763
91.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Alabama	City of Headland, Alabama	City of Headland, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	M.D. Ala. 1:19-cv-00886
92.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Alabama	City of Lanett, Alabama	City of Lanett, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	M.D. Ala. 3:19-cv-00885
93.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Alabama	City of Leeds, Alabama	City of Leeds, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Ala. 2:20-cv-00201
94.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Alabama	City of Level Plains, Alabama	City of Level Plains, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	M.D. Ala. 1:20-cv-00137
95.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Alabama	City of Linden, Alabama	City of Linden, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	S.D. Ala. 2:20-cv-00129
96.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Alabama	City of Luverne, Alabama	City of Luverne, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	M.D. Ala. 2:20-cv-00136
97.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Alabama	City of Oxford, Alabama	City of Oxford, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Ala. 1:19-cv-01401
98.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Alabama	City of Pell City, Alabama	City of Pell City, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Ala. 4:20-cv-00203
99.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Alabama	City of Satsuma, Alabama	City of Satsuma, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	S.D. Ala. 1:20-cv-00127
100.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Alabama	City of Uniontown, Alabama	City of Uniontown, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	S.D. Ala. 1:20-cv-00128
101.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Alabama	Coosa County, Alabama	Coosa County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	M.D. Ala. 2:19-cv-00752
102.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Alabama	Crenshaw County, Alabama	Crenshaw County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	M.D. Ala. 2:19-cv-00753
103.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Alabama	Escambia County, Alabama	Escambia County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	S.D. Ala. 1:20-cv-00134
104.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Alabama	Geneva County, Alabama	Geneva County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	M.D. Ala. 1:20-cv-00135

19-03-2023 9:51:50 AM  
 Document ID: 175-57-11  
 Page 94 of 275



	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
112.	The Purdue Frederick Company, Inc.; Richard Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler	Municipality	California	City of Fullerton and the People of the State of California by and through Fullerton City Attorney Richard D. Jones	City of Fullerton and the People of the State of California by and through Fullerton City Attorney Richard D. Jones v. Purdue Pharma L.P.	N.D. Cal. 3:19-cv-02321
113.	The Purdue Frederick Company, Inc.; Richard Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler	Municipality	California	City of Irvine and the People of the State of California by and through Irvine City Attorney Jeffrey Melching	City of Irvine and the People of the State of California by and through Irvine City Attorney Jeffrey Melching v. Purdue Pharma L.P.	N.D. Cal. 3:19-cv-02323

19-02289-9-01-11  
 Filed 01/15/20  
 Preliminary Injunction and Stay of Injunction  
 Pg 96 of 275

	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
114.	The Purdue Frederick Company, Inc.; Richard Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler	Municipality	California	City of San Clemente and the People of the State of California by and through San Clemente City Attorney Scott C. Smith	City of San Clemente and the People of the State of California, by and through San Clemente City Attorney Scott C. Smith v. Purdue Pharma L.P.	N.D. Cal. 4:19-cv-02326
115.	The Purdue Frederick Company, Inc.; Richard Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler	Municipality	California	City of Santa Ana and the People of the State of California, by and through Santa Ana City Attorney Sonia R. Carvalho	City of Santa Ana and the People of the State of California, by and through Santa Ana City Attorney Sonia R. Carvalho v. Purdue Pharma L.P.	N.D. Cal. 3:19-cv-02324

19-02289-9-011  
 Document 179-75 Filed 04/02/20 Entered 04/02/20 15:08:58 in Exhibit  
 Preliminary Injunction and Stay of Injunction Pg 97 of 275

	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
116.	The Purdue Frederick Company, Inc.; Richard Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler	Municipality	California	City of Westminster and the People of the State of California by and through Westminster City Attorney Richard D. Jones	City of Westminster and the People of the State of California by and through Westminster City Attorney Richard D. Jones v. Purdue Pharma L.P.	N.D. Cal. 3:19-cv-02325
117.	The Purdue Frederick Company, Inc.; Richard Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler	Municipality	California	County of Alameda and the People of the State of California by and through County Counsel Donna Ziegler	County of Alameda and the People of the State of California by and through County Counsel Donna Ziegler v. Purdue Pharma L.P.	N.D. Cal. 3:19-cv-02307
118.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Richard Sackler; Theresa Sackler; Kathe Sackler; Jonathan Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Beverly Sackler; David Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt	Municipality	Delaware	City of Dover, a municipal corporation of the State of Delaware; City of Seaford, a municipal corporation of the State of Delaware; Kent County, a political subdivision of the State of Delaware	City of Dover, a municipal corporation of the State of Delaware; City of Seaford, a municipal corporation of the State of Delaware; and Kent County, a political subdivision of the State of Delaware v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	D. Del. 1:19-cv-01749

19-02289-9-01-1  
 Document 173-75 Filed 04/02/20 Page 98 of 275  
 Preliminary Injunction and Stay  
 Case No. 19-02289-9-01-1  
 Pg 98 of 275

	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
119.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Florida	City of Ocala, Florida	City of Ocala, Florida v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	M.D. Fla. 5:19-cv-00440
120.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Raymond Sackler Family; Mortimer Sackler Family; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Stuart D. Baker; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	Municipality	Hawaii	County of Hawai'i	County of Hawai'i v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	D. Haw. 1:19-cv-00581
121.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Raymond Sackler Family; Mortimer Sackler Family; Richard S. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Stuart D. Baker; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	Municipality /Class Action	Hawaii	County of Kaua'i, a political subdivision of the State of Hawaii, for themselves individually, and on behalf of all similarly situated persons, and on behalf of the general public, as a class	County of Kaua'i, a political subdivision of the State of Hawaii, for themselves individually, and on behalf of all similarly situated persons, and on behalf of the general public, as a class v. Ciba Health Corporation, et al.	D. Haw. 1:19-cv-00377

19-02289-9 Filed 04/09/20 Entered 04/09/20 15:08:58  
 Preliminary Injunction Pg 99 of 275  
 Exhibit

	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
122.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Louisiana	Town of Abita Springs, Louisiana	Town of Abita Springs, Louisiana v. Purdue Pharma Inc., et al.	E.D. La. 2:19-cv-14521
123.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Louisiana	Warren Montgomery, Duly Elected 22nd Judicial District Attorney for the Parishes of St. Tammany and Washington	Warren Montgomery, Duly Elected 22nd Judicial District Attorney for the Parishes of St. Tammany and Washington v. Purdue Pharma Inc., et al.	E.D. La. 2:19-cv-14516
124.	The Purdue Frederick Company inc.	Municipality	Maine	City of Rockland, State of Maine	City of Rockland, State of Maine v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	D. Me. 2:19-cv-00373
125.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Maine	Knox County, State of Maine	Knox County, State of Maine, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	D. Me. 2:19-cv-00371
126.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Maryland	Howard County	Howard County, Maryland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	D. Md. 1:19-cv-02116
127.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Michigan	Charter Township of Harrison	Charter Township of Harrison v. The Pain Center USA, PLLC, et al.	E.D. Mich. 2:19-cv-11681
128.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Michigan	City of Sterling Heights	City of Sterling Heights v. The Pain Center USA, PLLC, et al.	E.D. Mich. 2:19-cv-11685
129.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Michigan	City of Warren	City of Warren v. The Pain Center USA, PLLC, et al.	E.D. Mich. 2:19-cv-11687
130.	Richard S. Sackler	Municipality	Missouri	Camden County, Missouri	Camden County, Missouri v. E. Williams et al.	E.D. Mo. 4:19-cv-02930
131.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Richard S. Sackler, M.D.	Municipality	Missouri	St. Francois County	St. Francois County v. E. Williams, M.D., et al.	E.D. Mo. 4:19-cv-01722
132.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Aida B. Maxsam	Municipality	Nevada	Clark County	Clark County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	D. Nev. 2:19-cv-01616

Case 1:19-cv-00373 Document 1-1 Filed 01/13/20 Page 100 of 275  
 Case 1:19-cv-00371 Document 1-1 Filed 01/13/20 Page 100 of 275  
 Case 1:19-cv-00373 Document 1-1 Filed 01/13/20 Page 100 of 275  
 Case 1:19-cv-00371 Document 1-1 Filed 01/13/20 Page 100 of 275  
 Case 1:19-cv-02116 Document 1-1 Filed 01/13/20 Page 100 of 275  
 Case 2:19-cv-11681 Document 1-1 Filed 01/13/20 Page 100 of 275  
 Case 2:19-cv-11685 Document 1-1 Filed 01/13/20 Page 100 of 275  
 Case 2:19-cv-11687 Document 1-1 Filed 01/13/20 Page 100 of 275  
 Case 4:19-cv-02930 Document 1-1 Filed 01/13/20 Page 100 of 275  
 Case 4:19-cv-01722 Document 1-1 Filed 01/13/20 Page 100 of 275  
 Case 2:19-cv-01616 Document 1-1 Filed 01/13/20 Page 100 of 275



	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
	Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.					
135.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Stuart D. Baker; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	Municipality	New Jersey	County of Burlington, NJ	County of Burlington, NJ v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	D.N.J. 1:19-cv-13684
136.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.	Municipality	New Jersey	Cumberland County	Cumberland County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	D. N.J. 1:19-cv-19134
137.	The Purdue Frederick Company	Municipality	New Jersey	Township of Brick	Township of Brick v. Purdue Pharma Inc., et al.	D. N.J. 3:19-cv-17998

19-02289-9 Filed 01/14/20 Entered 01/14/20 15:08:58  
 Preliminary Injunction Handled/Notified/Injunction Pg 102 of 275

	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
138.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Raymond Sackler Family; Mortimer Sackler Family; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Stuart D. Baker; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	Municipality	New York	City of Amsterdam	City of Amsterdam v. Purdue Pharma L.P.	N.D.N.Y. 1:19-cv-00896
139.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Raymond Sackler Family; Mortimer Sackler Family; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Stuart D. Baker; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	Municipality	New York	City of Auburn	City of Auburn v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	E.D.N.Y. 2:18-cv-03800

19-02289-96111 Doc 138-1 Filed 04/02/20 Entered 04/02/20 15:08:58 in Exhibit  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Disinjunction Pg 103 of 275



	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
142.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Raymond Sackler Family; Mortimer Sackler Family; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Stuart D. Baker; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	Municipality	New York	City of Rochester	City of Rochester v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	W.D.N.Y. 6:19-cv-06490
143.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Raymond Sackler Family; Mortimer Sackler Family; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Stuart D. Baker; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	Municipality	New York	City of Saratoga Springs	The City of Saratoga Springs v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D.N.Y. 1:19-cv-00789

19-08289-9-1-1  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Antitrust  
 Pg 105 of 275

	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
144.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Ohio	The County of Fayette, Ohio; The State of Ohio ex rel. Prosecuting Attorney of Fayette County, Jess Weade	The County of Fayette, Ohio; The State of Ohio ex rel. Prosecuting Attorney of Fayette County, Jess Weade v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	S.D. Ohio 2:19-cv-04347
145.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Oklahoma	Board of County Commissioners of Atoka County	Board of County Commissioners of Atoka County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	E.D. Okla. 6:19-cv-00279
146.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Oklahoma	Board of County Commissioners of Caddo County	Board of County Commissioners of Caddo County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	W.D. Okla. 5:19-cv-00710
147.	The Purdue Frederick Company	Municipality	Oklahoma	Board of County Commissioners of Cimarron County	Board of County Commissioners of Cimarron County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	W.D. Okla. 5:19-cv-00776
148.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Oklahoma	Board of County Commissioners of Coal County	Board of County Commissioners of Coal County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	E.D. Okla. 6:19-cv-00405
149.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Oklahoma	Board of County Commissioners of Grady County	Board of County Commissioners of Grady County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	W.D. Okla. 5:19-cv-00703
150.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Oklahoma	Board of County Commissioners of Haskell County	Board of County Commissioners of Haskell County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	E.D. Okla. 6:19-cv-00280
151.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Oklahoma	Board of County Commissioners of Jackson County	Board of County Commissioners of Jackson County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	W.D. Okla. 5:19-cv-01108
152.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Oklahoma	Board of County Commissioners of Jefferson County	Board of County Commissioners of Jefferson County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	W.D. Okla. 5:19-cv-00721

19-02289-9 Filed 02/20/20 Entered 02/20/20 14:05:07  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Restraining Order  
 Pg 105 of 275

	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
153.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Oklahoma	Board of County Commissioners of Kay County	Board of County Commissioners of Kay County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	W.D. Okla. 5:19-cv-00884
154.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Oklahoma	Board of County Commissioners of Latimer County	Board of County Commissioners of Latimer County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	E.D. Okla. 6:19-cv-00282
155.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Oklahoma	Board of County Commissioners of LeFlore County	Board of County Commissioners of LeFlore County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	E.D. Okla. 6:19-cv-00362
156.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Oklahoma	Board of County Commissioners of Lincoln County	Board of County Commissioners of Lincoln County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	W.D. Okla. 5:19-cv-01109
157.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Oklahoma	Board of County Commissioners of Logan County	Board of County Commissioners of Logan County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	W.D. Okla. 5:19-cv-00984
158.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Oklahoma	Board of County Commissioners of Love County	Board of County Commissioners of Love County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	E.D. Okla. 6:19-cv-00320
159.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Oklahoma	Board of County Commissioners of Major County	Board of County Commissioners of Major County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	W.D. Okla. 5:19-cv-00879
160.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Oklahoma	Board of County Commissioners of Okfuskee County	Board of County Commissioners of Okfuskee County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	E.D. Okla. 6:19-cv-00300
161.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Oklahoma	Board of County Commissioners of Oklahoma County	Board of County Commissioners of Oklahoma County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	W.D. Okla. 5:19-cv-00926

19-02289-9-0111  
 Preliminary Injunction  
 Filed 04/22/20 Entered 04/22/20 15:08:58  
 Page 107 of 275



	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
172.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Stuart D. Baker	Municipality	Pennsylvania	Adams County	Adams County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	E.D. Pa. 2:19-cv-04438
173.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	City of Allentown, Pennsylvania	City of Allentown, Pennsylvania v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corp., et al.	E.D. Pa. 5:19-cv-03884
174.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Texas	County of Angelina	County of Angelina v. Allergan PLC, et al.	S.D. Tex. 4:19-cv-03590
175.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Texas	County of Burleson	County of Burleson v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	S.D. Tex. 4:19-xc-03845
176.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Texas	County of Duval	County of Duval v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	S.D. Tex. 4:19-cv-02504
177.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Texas	County of Freestone	County of Freestone v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	S.D. Tex. 4:19-cv-03983
178.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Texas	County of Jim Hogg	County of Jim Hogg v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	S.D. Tex. 4:19-cv-02816
179.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Texas	County of Kleberg	County of Kleberg v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	S.D. Tex. 4:19-cv-02815
180.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Texas	County of Williamson	County of Williamson v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	S.D. Tex. 4:19-cv-03299
181.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Texas	Ellis County	Ellis County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	S.D. Tex. 4:19-cv-02256

19-02289-961dd D000471  
 7-5-19  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Order of Sequestration  
 Filed 07/05/20  
 Entered 07/05/20 10:20:10  
 Page 109 of 275



	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
188.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Richard Sackler; Theresa Sackler; Kathe Sackler; Jonathan Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Beverly Sackler; David Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt	Municipality	Virginia	City of Portsmouth	City of Portsmouth v. McKesson Corporation, et al.	E.D. Va. 2:19-cv-00331
189.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Virginia	City of Radford	City of Radford v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	W.D. Va. 7:19-cv-00525
190.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Richard Sackler; Beverly Sackler; David Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Jonathan Sackler; Kathe Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Theresa Sackler; John Stewart; Mark Timney; Craig Landau; Russell Gasdia; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.	Municipality	Virginia	City of Waynesboro, Virginia	The City of Waynesboro, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	W.D. Va. 5:19-cv-00058
191.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Virginia	Culpeper County	Culpeper County, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	W.D. Va. 3:19-cv-00037

19-02289-9 Filed 04/02/20 Entered 04/02/20 15:08:58  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Disinfectant  
 Pg 111 of 275







	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
	John Stewart; Mark Timney; Craig Landau; Russell Gasdia; Tessa Rios; Amy K. Thompson			Corporation; Baptist Healthcare System, Inc.; Baptist Health Madisonville, Inc.; Baptist Health Richmond, Inc.; Grayson County Hospital Foundation, Inc.; The Harrison Memorial Hospital, Inc.; Saint Elizabeth Medical Center, Inc.; St. Claire Medical Center, Inc.; Taylor County Hospital District Health Facilities Corporation	Healthcare System, Inc.; Baptist Health Madisonville, Inc.; Baptist Health Richmond, Inc.; Grayson County Hospital Foundation, Inc.; The Harrison Memorial Hospital, Inc.; Saint Elizabeth Medical Center, Inc.; St. Claire Medical Center, Inc. and Taylor County Hospital District Health Facilities Corporation v. Purdue Pharma, L.P., et al.	
208.	Richard Sackler; Theresa Sackler; Kathe Sackler; Jonathan Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; David Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt	Individual	Massachusetts	Hickey, Thomas	Thomas Hickey v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	D. Mass. 1:19-cv-11806
209.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Wrongful Death	Mississippi	Carr, Gary	Gary Carr, individually and as next friend and on behalf of all wrongful death beneficiaries of Luther G. Carr, deceased v. Charles E. Carr, M.D., et al.	N.D. Miss. 3:19-cv-00246

11/02/2020 10:50:58 AM  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Disinjunction  
 Pg 115 of 275

	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
210.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker	Third Party Payor	Pennsylvania	I-Kare Treatment Center, LLC	I-Kare Treatment Center, LLC v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	E.D. Pa. 2:19-cv-03899
211.	Richard Sackler; Jonathan Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; David Sackler; Kathe Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Stuart D. Baker	Third Party Payor	Pennsylvania	Public Service Insurance Company	Public Service Insurance Company v. Janssen Pharmaceuticals et al.	E.D. Pa. 2:19-cv-05904
212.	Richard Sackler; Mortimer David Alfons Sackler; The Sackler Family; Russell J. Gasdia; Craig Landau	Individual	Rhode Island	Heden, Keith D.	Keith D. Heden v. Purdue Pharmaceuticals LLC	D. R.I. 2:19-cv-00586
213.	Rhodes Technologies, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler, M.D.; Kathe A. Sackler; Jonathan D.	Class Action	Tennessee	Rhodes, Roger; Silvers, Anthony; Spradlen, Lea Anne	Roger Rhodes, Anthony Silvers, and Lea Anne Spradlen, on behalf of	M.D. Tenn. 3:19-cv-00885

19-02289-96111 Document 11-1 Filed 04/02/20 Entered 04/02/20 15:08:58  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Disinjunction Page 16 of 275

	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
	Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler				themselves and all others similarly situated v. Rhodes Technologies, Inc., et al.	
214.	The Purdue Frederick Company; Richard Sackler; Beverly Sackler; David Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Jonathan Sackler; Kathe Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Theresa Sackler; John Stewart; Mark Timney; Craig Landau; Russell Gasdia; Andrew T. Stokes	Hospital	Tennessee	Takoma Regional Hospital, Inc. f/k/a Takoma Hospital, Inc.; Amisub (SFH), Inc.; Baptist Womens Health Center, LLC; Campbell County Hma, LLC; Clarksville Health System, G.P.; Cleveland Tennessee Hospital Company, LLC; Cocke County Hma, LLC; Dickenson Community Hospital; Hawkins County Memorial Hospital f/k/a Hawkins County Memorial Hospital; Jefferson County HMA, LLC; Johnston Memorial Hospital, Inc.; Lebanon HMA, LLC f/k/a Lebanon HMA, Inc.; Lexington Hospital Corporation; Metro Knoxville HMA, LLC; Mountain States Health	Takoma Regional Hospital, Inc. f/k/a/ Takoma Hospital, Inc., et al., v. Purdue Pharma, L.P., et al.	E.D. Tenn. 2:19-cv-00157

1:08-cv-00011-DWM Document 1-1 Filed 01/20/20 Entered 01/20/20 15:08:58  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Disinjunction Pg 117 of 275





	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
220.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Richard Sackler; Theresa Sackler; Kathe Sackler; Jonathan Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Beverly Sackler; David Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt	Municipality	Arizona	City of Surprise	City of Surprise v. Allergan PLC, et al.	Maricopa Cnty. Super. Ct. Case No. CV2019-003439
221.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Richard Sackler; Theresa Sackler; Kathe Sackler; Jonathan Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Beverly Sackler; David Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt	Municipality	Arizona	County of Apache	County of Apache v. Allergan PLC, et al.	Apache Cnty. Super. Ct. Case No. S0100cv201900101
222.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Richard Sackler; Theresa Sackler; Kathe Sackler; Jonathan Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Beverly Sackler; David Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt	Municipality	Arizona	County of La Paz	County of La Paz v. Allergan PLC, et al.	La Paz Cnty. Super. Ct. Case No. S1500cv201900053
223.	Richard Sackler; Theresa Sackler; Kathe Sackler; Jonathan Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Beverly Sackler; David Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt	Municipality	Arizona	Pinal County	Pinal County v. Allergan PLC, et al.	Sup. Ct. Pinal Cnty. S1100CV201901448

19-02289-9-11-19  
 Filed 09/11/19  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Disinfection  
 19-02289-9-11-19  
 Filed 09/11/19  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Disinfection  
 Pg 120 of 275  
 Exhibit





	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
				City of North Little Rock; City of Conway; City of Rogers; City of Pine Bluff; City of Bentonville; City of Hot Springs; City of Benton; City of Texarkana; City of Sherwood; City of Jacksonville; City of Monticello		
225.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Memebers of the Raymond Sackler Family; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler	Municipality	California	City of El Monte, and The People of the State of California, by and through El Monte City Attorney Rick Olivarez	City of El Monte, and People of the State of California, by and through El Monte City Attorney Rick Olivarez v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	El Monte Cnty. Super. Ct. 19STCV10532

19-02289-9-01-19  
 Filed 01/19/20  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Declaratory Judgment  
 Pg 123 of 275



	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
228.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	California	The People of the State of California, acting by and through Santa Clara County Counsel James R. Williams, Orange County District Attorney Tony Rackauckas, Los Angeles County Counsel Mary C. Wickham, and Oakland City Attorney Barbara J. Parker	The People of the State of California, acting by and through Santa Clara County Counsel James R. Williams, Orange County District Attorney Tony Rackauckas, Los Angeles County Counsel Mary C. Wickham, and Oakland City Attorney Barbara J. Parker v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Orange County Super. Ct. 30-2014-00725287-CU-BT-CXC (Short version: 14-725287)
229.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Connecticut	City of Ansonia; The City of Danbury; The City of Derby; The City of Norwalk	The City of Ansonia, City of Danbury, The City of Derby, and The City of Norwalk v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Hartford State Super. Ct. HHD-CV-18-6098036-S
230.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Connecticut	City of Bridgeport; The Borough of Naugatuck; The Town of Southbury; The Town of Woodbury; The Town of Fairfield; The Town of Beacon Falls; The City of Milford; The Town of Oxford; The City of West Haven; The Town of North Haven; The Town of Thomaston; The City of Torrington; The City of Bristol; The Town of East	The City of Bridgeport v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Hartford State Super. Ct. HHD-CV-18-6088462-S

Case ID: 14-00725287-CU-BT-CXC  
 Document ID: 14-00725287-CU-BT-CXC-0001  
 Filed: 11/19/14  
 Page 125 of 275  
 Case Name: J. Parker v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.  
 Case Type: Preliminary Injunction and/or Damages  
 Case Status: Pending



	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
240.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Illinois	City of Sesser	City of Sesser v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. 2019-L-008147
241.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Illinois	County of Lake; Michael Nerheim, Lake County State's Attorney; Mark C. Curran, Jr., Lake County Sheriff; Dr. Howard Cooper, Lake County Coroner; The County of Lake in the Name of the People of the State of Illinois	County of Lake, et al. v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. 2018-L-003728
242.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Illinois	The People of the State of Illinois and Boone County, Illinois	The People of the State of Illinois and Boone County, Illinois v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Cir. Ct. Boone Cnty. 2018-L-000007  Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. 2018-L-004539
243.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Illinois	The People of the State of Illinois, and Bureau County, Illinois	The People of the State of Illinois and Bureau County, Illinois v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. 2018-L-004542
244.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Illinois	The People of the State of Illinois and Champaign County, Illinois	The People of the State of Illinois and Champaign County, Illinois v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Cir. Ct. Champaign Cnty. 2018-L-000006  Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. 2018-L-005935
245.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Illinois	The People of the State of Illinois, and Cook County, Illinois	The People of the State of Illinois and Cook County, Illinois v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Cir. Ct. Cook County 2017-L-013180
246.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Illinois	The People of the State of Illinois, and DeKalb County, Illinois	The People of the State of Illinois, and DeKalb County, Illinois v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Cir. Ct. DeKalb Cnty. 2018-L-000072  Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. 2018-L-013655

19-02289-9eidd  
 Preliminary Injunction and  
 Order of Contempt  
 Docket 19-02289-9eidd  
 Filed 04/10/20  
 Entered 04/10/20 11:50:58  
 Pg 127 of 275  
 Exhibit

	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
247.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Illinois	The People of the State of Illinois, and DuPage County, Illinois	The People of the State of Illinois and DuPage County, Illinois v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. 2018-L-004542
248.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Illinois	The People of the State of Illinois, and Henry County, Illinois	The People of the State of Illinois, and Henry County, Illinois v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Cir. Ct. Henry Cnty. 2018-L-000016  Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. 2018-L-012690
249.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Illinois	The People of the State of Illinois, and Jersey County, Illinois	The People of the State of Illinois, and Jersey County, Illinois v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. 2018-L-003908
250.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Illinois	The People of the State of Illinois, and Kane County, Illinois	The People of the State of Illinois and Kane County, Illinois v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Kankakee Cnty. 2017-L-000104  Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. 2018-L-004538
251.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Illinois	The People of the State of Illinois, and Kankakee County	The People of the State of Illinois, and Kankakee County, Illinois v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Kankakee Cnty. 2017-L-000104  Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. 2018-L-004538
252.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Illinois	The People of the State of Illinois, and Kendall County, Illinois	The People of the State of Illinois, and Kendall County, Illinois v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Cir. Ct. Kendall Cnty. 2018-L-000078  Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. 2018-L-012741

19-02289-9-0101  
 Pretrial  
 Doc 173-75-1  
 Filed 04/23/20  
 Entered 04/23/20 10:42:00  
 Page 128 of 275  
 Main Exhibit





	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
266.	The Purdue Frederick Company; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Jonathan D. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Richard S. Sackler; David Sackler; Theresa Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler	Municipality	Maryland	Anne Arundel County	Anne Arundel County, Maryland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Cir. Ct. Anne Arundel Cnty. C-02-CV-18-000021
267.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Richard Sackler; Theresa Sackler; Kathe Sackler; Jonathan Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Beverly Sackler; David Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt	Municipality	Maryland	Mayor & City Council of Baltimore	Mayor & City Council Baltimore v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Cir. Ct. Baltimore City 25C1800515
268.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Massachusetts	City of Boston; The Boston Public Health Commission; The Boston Housing Authority	City of Boston, The Boston Public Health Commission, The Boston Housing Authority v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Super. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 1884CV02860B
269.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Richard Sackler; Theresa Sackler; Kathe Sackler; Jonathan Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Beverly Sackler; David Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt	Municipality	Massachusetts	City of Cambridge	City of Cambridge v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Super. Ct. Middlesex Cnty. 19-1044

19-02289-9  
 Filed 04/02/20  
 Preliminary Injunction  
 Pg 131 of 275





	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
276.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc. Richard Sackler; Theresa Sackler; Kathe Sackler; Jonathan Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Beverly Sackler; David Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt	Municipality	Massachusetts	Town of Canton	Town of Canton v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Super. Ct. Norfolk Cnty. 18-1582
277.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc. Richard Sackler; Theresa Sackler; Kathe Sackler; Jonathan Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Beverly Sackler; David Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt	Municipality	Massachusetts	Town of Lynnfield	Town of Lynnfield v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Super. Ct. Essex Cnty. 1899CV01769D
278.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Richard Sackler; Theresa Sackler; Kathe Sackler; Jonathan Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Beverly Sackler; David Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt	Municipality	Massachusetts	Town of Natick	Town of Natick v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Super. Ct. Middlesex Cnty. 19-646

19-02289-9 Filed 04/02/20 Entered 04/02/20 15:08:58  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Injunction Pg 134 of 275

	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
279.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc; Richard Sackler; Theresa Sackler; Kathe Sackler; Jonathan Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Beverly Sackler; David Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt	Municipality	Massachusetts	Town of Randolph	Town of Randolph v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Super. Ct. Norfolk Cnty. 1982CV00400
280.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc. Richard Sackler; Theresa Sackler; Kathe Sackler; Jonathan Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Beverly Sackler; David Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt	Municipality	Massachusetts	Town of Springfield	Town of Springfield v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Super. Ct. Hampden Cnty. 18-938
281.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc. Richard Sackler; Theresa Sackler; Kathe Sackler; Jonathan Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Beverly Sackler; David Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt	Municipality	Massachusetts	Town of Wakefield	Town of Wakefield v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Super. Ct. Middlesex Cnty. 18-3458
282.	Beverly Sackler; David A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Jonathan D. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Theresa Sackler	Municipality	Missouri	Polk County, Missouri	Polk County, Missouri v. Allergan PLC, et al.	Cir. Ct. Polk Cnty. 1922-CC11660

19-02289-9-0111  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Antitrust  
 Filed 04/02/20 Entered 04/02/20 15:08:58  
 Pg 135 of 275









	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
				NY; Village of East Rockaway, NY; City of Elizabeth, NJ; Village of Farmingdale, NY; Village of Floral Park, NY; Village of Garden City, NY; Village of Greenport, NY; Town of Haverstraw, NY; Town of Hempstead, NY; Town of Huntington, NY; Village of Island Park, NY; Village of Islandia, NY; Town of Islip, NY; Village of Lake Grove, NY; Village of Lawrence, NY; Village of Lindenhurst, NY; Village of Lloyd Harbor, NY; City of Long Beach, NY; Village of Lynbrook, NY; Village of Massapequa Park, NY; Village of Mill Neck, NY;	19-02289-9 et al v DDD 19 75 Filed 10/20/20 Entered 10/20/20 15:08:58 Preliminary Injunction and/or Injunction Pg 140 of 275	

	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
				Village of Millerton, NY; Village of New Hyde Park, NY; Village of Nissequoge, NY; Town of North Hempstead, NY; Village of Northport, NY; Village of Old Westbury, NY; Town of Orangetown, NY; Town of Oyster Bay, NY; Borough of Paramus, NJ; Village of Patchogue, NY; Pierce County, GA; City of Pooler, GA; Village of Poquott, NY; Village of Port Washington North, NY; City of Richmond Hill, GA; Town of Riverhead, NY; Village of Saltaire, NY; Town of Smithtown, NY; Town of Southampton, NY; Town of Southold, NY; Village of Stewart Manor, NY; Village of Suffern, NY;	19-02289-96111 Preliminary Injunction and/or Declaratory Judgment Pg 141 of 275	



	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
293.	The Purdue Frederick Company; The P.F. Laboratories; PRA Holdings, Inc.; Pharmaceutical Research Associates, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Coventry Technologies L.P.; PLP Associates Holdings L.P.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Stuart D. Baker; Beverly Sackler, Richard S. Sackler, and Jonathan D. Sackler, as Trustees under Trust Agreement dated November 5, 1974	Municipality	New York	City of Ithaca	City of Ithaca v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty 400002/2018
294.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	New York	City of Mount Vernon	The City of Mount Vernon v. Purdue Pharma L.P.,	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400016/2019

19-02289-96111 Doc 1-1 Filed 04/02/20 Entered 04/02/20 15:08:58  
 Preliminary Injunction and Motion for Injunction Pg 143 of 275

	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
295.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Stuart D. Baker; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	Municipality	New York	City of New York	City of New York v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty 400006/2018
296.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker	Municipality	New York	City of Plattsburgh	City of Plattsburgh v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400003/2019

19-02289-96111 Doc 1-1 Filed 04/02/20 Entered 04/02/20 17:50:58  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Disinjunction  
 Pg 144 of 275

	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
297.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker	Municipality	New York	City of Schenectady	City of Schenectady v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400005/2019
298.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker	Municipality	New York	City of Troy	City of Troy v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400006/2019

19-02289-96111 Doc 1 Filed 04/02/20 Entered 04/02/20 17:50:58  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Permanent Injunction  
 Pg 145 of 275





	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
306.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Stuart D. Baker; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family oratories Inc.	Municipality	New York	County of Columbia	County of Columbia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400015/2018
307.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Stuart D. Baker; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	Municipality	New York	County of Cortland	County of Cortland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400019/2018

19-02289-96111 Doc 13 Filed 04/02/20 Entered 04/02/20 17:50:58  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Attachment  
 Pg 148 of 275

	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
308.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Stuart D. Baker; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	Municipality	New York	County of Dutchess	County of Dutchess v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400005/2017
309.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Stuart D. Baker; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	Municipality	New York	County of Erie	County of Erie v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400003/2017
310.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	New York	County of Essex	County of Essex v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty 400019/2019

19-02289-96111 Doc 1 Filed 04/02/20 Entered 04/02/20 15:08:58  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Dispositive Injunction Page 149 of 275



	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
	Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family					
313.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories; PRA Holdings, Inc.; Pharmaceutical Research Associates, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Coventry Technologies L.P.; PLP Associates Holdings L.P.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Stuart D. Baker; Beverly Sackler, Richard S. Sackler, and Jonathan D. Sackler, as Trustees under Trust Agreement dated November 5, 1974	Municipality	New York	County of Genesee	County of Genesee v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.  19-02289-9 et al. v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al. Preliminary Injunction and Request for Appointment of Receiver Docket 19-02289-9 Filed 04/02/20 19-02289-9 04/02/20 1:50:58 PM Main Exhibit Pg 151 of 275	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400011/2018
314.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler;	Municipality	New York	County of Greene	County of Greene v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400008/2018

	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
	Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Stuart D. Baker; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family					
315.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories; PRA Holdings, Inc.; Pharmaceutical Research Associates, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Coventry Technologies L.P.; PLP Associates Holdings L.P.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Stuart D. Baker; Beverly Sackler, Richard S. Sackler, and Jonathan D. Sackler, as Trustees under Trust Agreement dated November 5, 1974	Municipality	New York	County of Hamilton	County of Hamilton v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty 400005/2018

11/22/2017 11:50:08 AM  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Restraining Order  
 Pg 152 of 275







	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
	Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Stuart D. Baker; Beverly Sackler, Richard S. Sackler, and Jonathan D. Sackler, as Trustees under Trust Agreement dated November 5, 1974					
324.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Stuart D. Baker; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	Municipality	New York	County of Ontario	The County of Ontario v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al. Preliminary Injunction and/or Disinjunction	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400001-2019

19-02289-9 Filed 04/02/20 Entered 04/02/20 15:08:58 in Eastern District of Virginia  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Disinjunction Pg 156 of 275







	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
	Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family					
332.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories; PRA Holdings, Inc.; Pharmaceutical Research Associates, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Coventry Technologies L.P.; PLP Associates Holdings L.P.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Stuart D. Baker; Beverly Sackler, Richard S. Sackler, and Jonathan D. Sackler, as Trustees under Trust Agreement dated November 5, 1974	Municipality	New York	County of Schoharie	County of Schoharie v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.  19-02289-9 et al. v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al. Preliminary Injunction and/or Disinjunction	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400010/2017
333.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories; PRA Holdings, Inc.; Pharmaceutical Research Associates, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Coventry Technologies L.P.; PLP Associates Holdings L.P.; Richard S. Sackler;	Municipality	New York	County of Schuyler	County of Schuyler v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400014/2018

19-02289-9 et al. v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al. Preliminary Injunction and/or Disinjunction Pg 160 of 275

	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
	Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Stuart D. Baker; Beverly Sackler, Richard S. Sackler, and Jonathan D. Sackler, as Trustees under Trust Agreement dated November 5, 1974					
334.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Stuart D. Baker; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	Municipality	New York	County of Seneca	County of Seneca v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400006/2017

19-02289-9-01-01  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Contempt  
 10/04/2017 10:51:08 AM  
 Pg 161 of 275

	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
335.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Stuart D. Baker; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	Municipality	New York	County of St. Lawrence	County of St. Lawrence v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk County 400002/2019
336.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories; PRA Holdings, Inc.; Pharmaceutical Research Associates, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Coventry Technologies L.P.; PLP Associates Holdings L.P.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Stuart D. Baker; Beverly Sackler, Richard S. Sackler, and Jonathan D.	Municipality	New York	County of Steuben	County of Steuben v. The Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty 400004/2018

19-02289-96111 Doc 11 Filed 04/02/20 Entered 04/02/20 15:08:58  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Disinjunction Pg 162 of 275

	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
	Sackler, as Trustees under Trust Agreement dated November 5, 1974					
337.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Stuart D. Baker; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	Municipality	New York	County of Suffolk	County of Suffolk v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk County 400001/2017
338.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Stuart D. Baker; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	Municipality	New York	County of Sullivan	County of Sullivan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Sup. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. 400007/2017

19-02289-96111 Doc 73-75 Filed 11/04/20 Entered 11/04/20 15:08:58  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Injunction Pg 163 of 275









	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
356.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Oklahoma	Board of County Commissioners of McCurtain County	Board of County Commissioners of McCurtain County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	D. Ct. McCurtain Cnty. CJ-2019-54
357.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Oklahoma	Board of County Commissioners of Noble County	Board of County Commissioners of Noble County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	D. Ct. Noble Cnty. CJ-2019-05
358.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Oklahoma	City of Burns Flat	City of Burns Flat v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	D. Ct. Washita Cnty. CJ-2019-29
359.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	Armstrong County	Armstrong County, PA v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Armstrong Cty. 2017-1570-CV
360.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	Beaver County, Pennsylvania	Beaver County, Pennsylvania v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Beaver Cnty 11326-2017
361.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Rhodes Technologies, Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals, Inc.; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Stuart D. Baker	Municipality	Pennsylvania	Bedford County	Bedford County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Bedford Cnty. 180-2020
362.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	Bucks County	Bucks County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Bucks Cnty. No. 2018-03144
363.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	Cambria County, Pennsylvania	Cambria County, Pennsylvania v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Cambria Cnty 2017-4131

19-02289-9 Filed 02/20/20 Entered 02/20/20 15:08:58  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Temporary Injunction  
 Pg 168 of 275

	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
364.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Richard Sackler; Theresa Sackler; Jonathan Sackler; Kathe Sackler; Jonathan Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Beverly Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Craig Landau; John Stewart; Mark Timney	Municipality	Pennsylvania	City of Lock Haven	City of Lock Haven v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Clinton Cnty. 1126-2018
365.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	City of Philadelphia	City of Philadelphia v. Allergan PLC, et al.	C.P. Philadelphia January Term, 2018 No. 02718
366.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	City of Pittsburgh	City of Pittsburgh v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Allegheny Cnty. 18-006153
367.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	Clearfield County, Pennsylvania	Clearfield County, Pennsylvania v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Clearfield Cnty. 2018-1484-CD
368.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	Clinton County	Clinton County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Clinton Cnty. 752-2018
369.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	Commonwealth of PA, acting by and through Philadelphia District Attorney Lawrence S. Krasner	Commonwealth of PA, acting by and through Philadelphia District Attorney Lawrence S. Krasner v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Delaware Cnty. CV-2017-008095  Phila. Ct. Com. Pl., January Term 2018, No. 05594
370.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Pennsylvania	Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, acting by and through John T. Adams, the District Attorney of Berks County	Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, acting by and through John T. Adams, District Attorney of Berks County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corp., et al.	C.P. Berks Cnty. 19-18232

19-02289-961dd  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Stay  
 Filed 04/05/20 Entered 04/14/20 14:52:07  
 Pg 169 of 275









	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
	Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker					
404.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; P.F. Laboratories Inc.; Leavis Sullivan; Leigh Varnadore; Paul Kitchin; Beth Taylor; Mark Waldrop; Michael Madden; Wendy Kay; Jeffrey Ward; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker	Municipality	South Carolina	City of North Charleston	City of North Charleston Purdue Pharma L.P., et al	C.P. Charleston Cnty. 2019-CP-10-03978

19-02289-9 Filed 04/02/20 Entered 04/02/20 15:08:58  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Restraining Injunction Pg 174 of 275

	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
405.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; P.F. Laboratories, Inc.;Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker; Leavis Sullivan; Beth Taylor; Leigh Varnadore; Paul Kitchin; Wendy Kay; Michael Madden; Jeffrey Ward; Mark Waldrop	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Abbeville	County of Abbeville v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.	C.P. Abbeville Cnty. 2019-CP-01-00154
406.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceutical Inc.; P.F. Laboratories, Inc.;Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler;	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Aiken	County of Aiken v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.	C.P. Aiken Cnty. 2019-CP-02-01086

19-02289-96111 Doc 13 Filed 04/02/20 Entered 04/02/20 15:08:58 in Exhibit  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Temporary Injunction Pg 175 of 275

	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
	Trust for the Benefit Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker; Leavis Sullivan; Beth Taylor; Leigh Varnadore; Paul Kitchin; Wendy Kay; Michael Madden; Jeffrey Ward; Mark Waldrop					
407.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker; Leavis Sullivan; Beth Taylor; Leigh Varnadore; Paul Kitchin; Wendy Kay; Michael Madden; Jeffrey Ward; Mark Waldrop	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Allendale	County of Allendale v. et al. Aid of South Carolina et al.	C.P. Allendale Cnty. 2018-CP-03-00125

19-02289-9-01-19  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Temporary Injunction Pg 176 of 275  
 11/14/2018 10:20:50 AM  
 Exhibit

	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
408.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker; Leavis Sullivan; Beth Taylor; Leigh Varnadore; Paul Kitchin; Wendy Kay; Michael Madden; Jeffrey Ward; Mark Waldrop	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Anderson	County of Anderson v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.	C.P. Anderson Cnty. 2018-CP-04-01108
409.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler;	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Bamberg	County of Bamberg v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc.	C.P. Bamberg Cnty. 2018-CP-05-00189

19-02289-96111 Doc 13 Filed 04/02/20 Entered 04/02/20 15:08:58 in Exhibit  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Temporary Injunction Pg 177 of 275

	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
	Trust for the Benefit Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker; Leavis Sullivan; Beth Taylor; Leigh Varnadore; Paul Kitchin; Wendy Kay; Michael Madden; Jeffrey Ward; Mark Waldrop					
410.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker; Leavis Sullivan; Beth Taylor; Leigh Varnadore; Paul Kitchin; Wendy Kay; Michael Madden; Jeffrey Ward; Mark Waldrop	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Barnwell	County of Barnwell v. Board of Aid of South Carolina Preliminary Injunction and/or Temporary Injunction	C.P. Barnwell Cnty. 2018-CP-06-00329

19-02289-9-01-19  
FILED IN 19-02289-9-01-19  
Pg 178 of 275

	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
411.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker; Leavis Sullivan; Beth Taylor; Leigh Varnadore; Paul Kitchin; Wendy Kay; Michael Madden; Jeffrey Ward; Mark Waldrop	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Beaufort	County of Beaufort v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.  19-02289-9-0001 Preliminary Injunction and/or Restraining Injunction	C.P. Beaufort Cnty. 2018-CP-07-01245

19-02289-9-0001  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Restraining Injunction Pg 179 of 275

	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
412.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc; P.F. Laboratories, Inc.;Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker; Leavis Sullivan; Beth Taylor; Leigh Varnadore; Paul Kitchin; Wendy Kay; Michael Madden; Jeffrey Ward; Mark Waldrop	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Calhoun	County of Calhoun v. Rite Aid of South Carolina Inc., et al.	C.P. Calhoun Cnty. 2019-CP-09-00065
413.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler;	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Cherokee	County of Cherokee v. Rite Aid of South Carolina Inc., et al.	C.P. Cherokee Cnty. 2018-CP-11-00503

19-08289-96111 Doc 1 Filed 10/20/19 Page 1 of 1  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Temporary Restraining Order  
 Pg 180 of 275

	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
	Trust for the Benefit Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker; Leavis Sullivan; Beth Taylor; Leigh Varnadore; Paul Kitchin; Wendy Kay; Michael Madden; Jeffrey Ward; Mark Waldrop					
414.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker; Leavis Sullivan; Beth Taylor; Leigh Varnadore; Paul Kitchin; Wendy Kay; Michael Madden; Jeffrey Ward; Mark Waldrop	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Chesterfield	County of Chesterfield v. Rite Aid of South Carolina et al.	C.P. Chesterfield Cnty. 2018-CP-13-00410

19-02289-9-01-1  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Temporary Injunction Pg 181 of 275  
 10/20/2017 10:50:58 AM  
 Exhibit

	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
415.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker; Leavis Sullivan; Beth Taylor; Leigh Varnadore; Paul Kitchin; Wendy Kay; Michael Madden; Jeffrey Ward; Mark Waldrop	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Clarendon	County of Clarendon v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.	C.P. Clarendon Cnty. 2019-CP-14-00236
416.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler;	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Colleton	County of Colleton v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.	C.P. Colleton Cnty. 2018-CP-15-00438

19-02289-96111 Doc 14 Filed 04/02/20 Entered 04/02/20 15:08:58  
 Preliminary Injunction and Denial of Injunction Pg 182 of 275

	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
	Trust for the Benefit Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker; Leavis Sullivan; Beth Taylor; Leigh Varnadore; Paul Kitchin; Wendy Kay; Michael Madden; Jeffrey Ward; Mark Waldrop					
417.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker; Leavis Sullivan; Beth Taylor; Leigh Varnadore; Paul Kitchin; Wendy Kay; Michael Madden; Jeffrey Ward; Mark Waldrop	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Dillon	County of Dillon v. Rhodes of South Carolina, Inc.  Preliminary Injunction and	C.P. Dillon Cnty. 2019-CP-17-00213

19-02289-9-01-15  
 Filed 04/02/20  
 Preliminary Injunction and  
 Pg 188 of 275



	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
	Trust for the Benefit Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker; Leavis Sullivan; Beth Taylor; Leigh Varnadore; Paul Kitchin; Wendy Kay; Michael Madden; Jeffrey Ward; Mark Waldrop					
420.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker; Leavis Sullivan; Beth Taylor; Leigh Varnadore; Paul Kitchin; Wendy Kay; Michael Madden; Jeffrey Ward; Mark Waldrop	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Fairfield	County of Fairfield v. et al. Preliminary Injunction and/or Antitrust Injunction	C.P. Fairfield Cnty. 2018-CP-20-00272

19-02289-9-01-19  
FILED IN 19-02289-9-01-19  
Pg 185 of 275

	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
421.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker; Leavis Sullivan; Beth Taylor; Leigh Varnadore; Paul Kitchin; Wendy Kay; Michael Madden; Jeffrey Ward; Mark Waldrop	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Florence	County of Florence v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.  19-02289-9-0001 Preliminary Injunction and/or Restraining Order	C.P. Florence Cnty. 2019-CP-21-01213

19-02289-9-0001  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Restraining Order  
 Pg 186 of 275

	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
422.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker; Leavis Sullivan; Beth Taylor; Leigh Varnadore; Paul Kitchin; Wendy Kay; Michael Madden; Jeffrey Ward; Mark Waldrop	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Greenwood	County of Greenwood v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.	C.P. Cherokee Cnty. 2018-CP-24-00775
423.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler;	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Hampton	County of Hampton v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.	C.P. Hampton Cnty. 2018-CP-25-00258

19-02289-96111 Doc 13 Filed 04/02/20 Entered 04/02/20 15:08:58  
 Preliminary Injunction and Motion for Injunction Pg 187 of 275

	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
	Trust for the Benefit Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker; Leavis Sullivan; Beth Taylor; Leigh Varnadore; Paul Kitchin; Wendy Kay; Michael Madden; Jeffrey Ward; Mark Waldrop					
424.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker; Leavis Sullivan; Beth Taylor; Leigh Varnadore; Paul Kitchin; Wendy Kay; Michael Madden; Jeffrey Ward; Mark Waldrop	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Horry	County of Horry v. Rhodes and Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc. et al. Preliminary Injunction and/or Restraining Injunction	C.P. Horry Cnty. 2019-CP-26-02684

19-02289-9-01-0004 7:51 Filed 04/02/20 Entered 04/02/20 15:08:58 in Exhibit  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Restraining Injunction Pg 188 of 275

	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
425.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker; Leavis Sullivan; Beth Taylor; Leigh Varnadore; Paul Kitchin; Wendy Kay; Michael Madden; Jeffrey Ward; Mark Waldrop	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Jasper	County of Jasper v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.	C.P. Jasper Cnty. 2018-CP-27-00332
426.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler;	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Kershaw	County of Kershaw v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc.	C.P. Kershaw Cnty. 2018-CP-28-00553

19-02289-96111 Doc 13 Filed 04/02/20 Entered 04/02/20 15:08:58  
 Preliminary Injunction and Motion for Injunction Pg 189 of 275

	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
	Trust for the Benefit Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker; Leavis Sullivan; Beth Taylor; Leigh Varnadore; Paul Kitchin; Wendy Kay; Michael Madden; Jeffrey Ward; Mark Waldrop					
427.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceutical Inc.; P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker; Leavis Sullivan; Beth Taylor; Leigh Varnadore; Paul Kitchin; Wendy Kay; Michael Madden; Jeffrey Ward; Mark Waldrop	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Lancaster	County of Lancaster v. et al. Aid of South Carolina et al.	C.P. Lancaster Cnty. 2019-CP-29-00540

19-02289-9-01-19  
 Filed 04/02/20  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Temporary Injunction  
 Pg 190 of 275  
 04/02/20 15:08:58  
 Exhibit



	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
429.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker; Leavis Sullivan; Beth Taylor; Leigh Varnadore; Paul Kitchin; Wendy Kay; Michael Madden; Jeffrey Ward; Mark Waldrop	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Lee	County of Lee v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.	C.P. Lee Cnty. 2018-CP-31-00207
430.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler;	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Lexington	County of Lexington v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.	C.P. Lexington Cnty. 2018-CP-32-02207

19-02289-96111 Doc 13 Filed 04/02/20 Entered 04/02/20 15:08:58  
 Preliminary Injunction and Order of Injunction Pg 192 of 275

	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
	Trust for the Benefit Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker; Leavis Sullivan; Beth Taylor; Leigh Varnadore; Paul Kitchin; Wendy Kay; Michael Madden; Jeffrey Ward; Mark Waldrop					
431.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker; Leavis Sullivan; Beth Taylor; Leigh Varnadore; Paul Kitchin; Wendy Kay; Michael Madden; Jeffrey Ward; Mark Waldrop	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Marion	County of Marion v. Board of South Carolina, Inc. Preliminary Injunction and	C.P. Marion Cnty. 2019-CP-33-00299

19-02289-9-01-1  
 Filed 04/02/20  
 Preliminary Injunction and  
 Pg 198 of 275

	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
432.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker; Leavis Sullivan; Beth Taylor; Leigh Varnadore; Paul Kitchin; Wendy Kay; Michael Madden; Jeffrey Ward; Mark Waldrop	Municipality	South Carolina	County of McCormick	County of McCormick v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.	C.P. McCormick Cnty. 2019-CP-35-00031
433.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler;	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Oconee	County of Oconee v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.	C.P. Oconee Cnty. 2018-CP-37-00458

19-02289-96111 Doc 13 Filed 04/02/20 Entered 04/02/20 15:08:58  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Temporary Injunction Pg 194 of 275

	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
	Trust for the Benefit Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker; Leavis Sullivan; Beth Taylor; Leigh Varnadore; Paul Kitchin; Wendy Kay; Michael Madden; Jeffrey Ward; Mark Waldrop					
434.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker; Leavis Sullivan; Beth Taylor; Leigh Varnadore; Paul Kitchin; Wendy Kay; Michael Madden; Jeffrey Ward; Mark Waldrop	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Orangeburg	County of Orangeburg, Site Aid of South Carolina et al.	C.P. Orangeburg Cnty. 2018-CP-38-00841

19-02289-9-01-17  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Antitrust Injunction  
 Filed 04/02/20 Entered 04/02/20 15:08:58  
 Pg 195 of 275



	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
436.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker; Leavis Sullivan; Beth Taylor; Leigh Varnadore; Paul Kitchin; Wendy Kay; Michael Madden; Jeffrey Ward; Mark Waldrop	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Saluda	County of Saluda v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.	C.P. Clarendon Cnty. 2019-CP-41-00111
437.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Rhodes Techonologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler;	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Sumter	County of Sumter v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.	C.P. Sumter Cnty. 2019-CP-43-00891

19-02289-96111 Doc 19-75 Filed 04/02/20 Entered 04/02/20 15:08:58 in Exhibit  
 Preliminary Injunction and Stay Order Pg 197 of 275

	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
	Trust for the Benefit Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker; Leavis Sullivan; Beth Taylor; Leigh Varnadore; Paul Kitchin; Wendy Kay; Michael Madden; Jeffrey Ward; Mark Waldrop					
438.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker; Leavis Sullivan; Beth Taylor; Leigh Varnadore; Paul Kitchin; Wendy Kay; Michael Madden; Jeffrey Ward; Mark Waldrop	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Union	County of Union v. R. Ad of South Carolina, Inc. Preliminary Injunction and	C.P. Union Cnty. 2018-CP-44-00288

19-02289-9-1-1  
 Filed 04/02/20  
 Preliminary Injunction and  
 Pg 198 of 275

	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
439.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker; Leavis Sullivan; Beth Taylor; Leigh Varnadore; Paul Kitchin; Wendy Kay; Michael Madden; Jeffrey Ward; Mark Waldrop	Municipality	South Carolina	County of Williamsburg	County of Williamsburg v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.	C.P. Williamsburg Cnty. 2018-CP-45-00276
440.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler;	Municipality	South Carolina	County of York	County of York v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.	C.P. York Cnty. 2018-CP-46-02446

19-02289-96111 Doc 13 Filed 04/02/20 Entered 04/02/20 15:08:58  
 Preliminary Injunction and Motion for Injunction Pg 199 of 275

	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
	Trust for the Benefit Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker; Leavis Sullivan; Beth Taylor; Leigh Varnadore; Paul Kitchin; Wendy Kay; Michael Madden; Jeffrey Ward; Mark Waldrop					
441.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker; Leavis Sullivan; Beth Taylor; Leigh Varnadore; Paul Kitchin; Wendy Kay; Michael Madden; Jeffrey Ward; Mark Waldrop	Municipality	South Carolina	Greenville County	Greenville County v. State Aid of South Carolina, Inc.  Preliminary Injunction and/or Permanent Injunction	C.P. Greenville Cnty. 2018-CP-23-01294

19-02289-9-01-1  
 Filed 04/02/20 10:20:50  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Permanent Injunction Pg 200 of 275

	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
442.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker; Leavis Sullivan; Beth Taylor; Leigh Varnadore; Paul Kitchin; Wendy Kay; Michael Madden; Jeffrey Ward; Mark Waldrop	Municipality	South Carolina	Spartanburg County	Spartanburg County v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.  19-02289-9-01-0001 Preliminary Injunction and Request for Appointment of Receiver Filed 04/10/2019 10:20:50 AM Pg 201 of 275	C.P. Spartanburg Cnty. 2018-CP-42-00760















	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
473.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Texas	County of McMullen	County of McMullen v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Harris Cnty. Dist. Ct. 2018-77067
474.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Texas	County of Milam	County of Milam v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Harris Cnty. Dist. Ct. 2018-77141
475.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Texas	County of Nacogdoches	County of Nacogdoches v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Harris Cnty. Dist. Ct. 2018-77027
476.	The Purdue Frederick Company; The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Texas	County of Nueces; Nueces County Hospital District	County of Nueces and Nueces County Hospital District v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Harris Cnty. Dist. Ct. 2018-77083
477.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Texas	County of Orange	County of Orange v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Harris Cnty. Dist. Ct. 2018-77036
478.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Texas	County of Panola	County of Panola v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Harris Cnty. Dist. Ct. 2018-77037
479.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Texas	County of Parker	County of Parker v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Harris Cnty. Dist. Ct. 2018-77143
480.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Texas	County of Potter	County of Potter v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Harris Cnty. Dist. Ct. 2018-77039
481.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Texas	County of Robertson	County of Robertson v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Harris Cnty. Dist. Ct. 2018-77043
482.	The Purdue Frederick Company; The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Texas	County of San Patricio	County of San Patricio v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Harris Cnty. Dist. Ct. 2018-77075
483.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Texas	County of Shelby	County of Shelby v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Harris Cnty. Dist. Ct. 2018-77062
484.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Texas	County of Travis	County of Travis v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Harris Cnty. Dist. Ct. 2018-77144
485.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Texas	County of Trinity	County of Trinity v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Harris Cnty. Dist. Ct. 2018-77080
486.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Texas	County of Van Zandt	County of Van Zandt v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corp., et al.	Harris Cnty. Dist. Ct. 2018-77150
487.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Texas	County of Waller	County of Waller v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Harris Cnty. Dist. Ct. 2018-77153
488.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Texas	County of Wood	County of Wood v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	Harris Cnty. Dist. Ct. 2018-77081

11/09/2019 10:58:58 AM  
 Filed in Case No. 19-00000-0000  
 Page 209 of 275

	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
489.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Texas	Johnson County	Johnson County v. Purdue Pharma, L.P. et al.	Harris Cnty. Dist. Ct. 2018-87346
490.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Stuart D. Baker; Trust for the Benefit of the Raymond Sackler Family; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals, Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.	Municipality	Utah	Cache County, Utah; Rich County, Utah	Cache County, Utah; Rich County, Utah v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1st Dist. Ct. Cache Cnty. 190100112
491.	The Purdue Frederick Company	Municipality	Utah	Davis County	Davis County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	2nd Dist. Ct. Davis Cnty. 180700870
492.	The Purdue Frederick Company	Municipality	Utah	Grand County	Grand County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	7th Jud. Dist. Ct. Grand Cnty. 180700040
493.	The Purdue Frederick Company	Municipality	Utah	Iron County	Iron County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	5th Jud. Dist. Ct. Iron Cnty. 180500149
494.	The Purdue Frederick Company	Municipality	Utah	Millard County	Millard County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	4th Jud. Dist. Ct. Millard Cnty. 180700044
495.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Municipality	Utah	Salt Lake County	Salt Lake County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	3rd Jud. Dist. Ct. Salk Lake Cnty. 180902421
496.	The Purdue Frederick Company	Municipality	Utah	San Juan County	San Juan County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	7th Jud. Dist. Ct. Grand Cnty. 180700040
497.	The Purdue Frederick Company	Municipality	Utah	Sanpete County	Sanpete County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	6th Jud. Dist. Ct. Sanpete Cnty. 180600095

19-02289-96111 Doc 14 Filed 04/22/20 Entered 04/19/20 02:07:50 Page 210 of 275  
 Preliminary Injunction and Order of Seizure









	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
509.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc. Mark Radcliffe; Mark Ross; Patty Carnes	Municipality	West Virginia	Brooke County Commission; Hancock County Commission; Harrison County Commission; Lewis County Commission; Marshall County Commission; Ohio County Commission; Tyler County Commission; Wetzel County Commission	Brooke County Commission, Hancock County Commission, Harrison County Commission, Lewis County Commission, Marshall County Commission, Ohio County Commission, Tyler County Commission, and Wetzel County Commission v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al	Cir. Ct. Marshall Cnty. 17-C-248H 17-C-249H 17-C-250H 17-C-251H 17-C-252H 17-C-253H 17-C-254H 17-C-255H  Consolidated before MLP In re Opioid Litigation , Cir. Ct. Kanawha County 19-C-9000
510.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Patty Carnes; Carol Debord; Jeff Waugh; Shane Cook; Mark Ross	Municipality	West Virginia	The County Commission of Mason County; The County Commission of Barbour County; Mayor Chris Tatum on behalf of The Village of Barboursville; The County Commission of Taylor County; The County Commission of Webster County; Mayor Don E. McCourt, on behalf of the Town of Addison a/k/a The Town of Webster Springs	The County Commission of Mason County; The County Commission of Barbour County; Mayor Chris Tatum on behalf of The Village of Barboursville; The County Commission of Taylor County; The County Commission of Webster County; and Mayor Don E. McCourt, on behalf of the Town of Addison a/k/a The Town of Webster Springs; Purdue Pharma L.P., et al	Cir. Ct. Marshall County 19-C-4H 19-C-5H 19-C-6H 19-C-7H 19-C-8H 19-C-9H  Consolidated before MLP In re Opioid Litigation, Cir. Ct. Kanawha County 19-C-9000

19-002289-9-1-1  
 Preliminary  
 19-002289-9-1-1  
 01/11/2019 10:50:58 AM  
 Pg 215 of 275









	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
				LLC; Hialeah Hospital, Inc.; HMA Santa Rosa Medical Center, LLC; Key West HMA, LLC; Lake Shore HMA, LLC; Lake Wales Hospital Corporation; Larkin Community Hospital Palm Springs Campus, LLC; Larkin Community Hospital, Inc.; Larkin Community Hospital Behavioral Service, Inc.; Leesburg Regional Medical Center, Inc.; Lifemark Hospitals of Florida, Inc.; Live Oak HMA, LLC; Naples HMA, LLC; North Shore Medical Center, Inc.; Osceolasc LLC; Palm Beach Gardens Community Hospital, Inc.; Port Charlotte HMA, LLC; Punta Gorda HMA, LLC; St. Mary's Medical Center, Inc.; Starke HMA, LLC; The Villages Tri-County Medical Center, Inc.; and Venice HMA, LLC	19-02289-9-01-0001 Preliminary Injunction and/or Injunction	
521.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Beverly Sackler; David A. Sackler;	University	Louisiana	The Board of Supervisors for Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College	The Board of Supervisors for Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corp., et al.	19th Jud. Dist. Ct. East Baton Rouge Parish C-694318 24

19-02289-9-01-0001  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Injunction  
 Filed 04/22/20 Entered 04/22/20 7:50:58 AM  
 Pg 220 of 275  
 Exhibit



	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
				Merit Health Natchez; North Sunflower Medical Center; River Oaks Hospital, LLC d/b/a Merit Health River Oaks; Vicksburg Healthcare, LLC d/b/a Merit Health River Region and Merit Health River Region West; Roh, LLC d/b/a Merit Health Women's Hospital; Tippah County Hospital; Alliance Healthcare System; Memorial Hospital at Gulfport; Delta Regional Medical Center; Progressive Medical Management of Batesville d/b/a Panola Medical Center; Boa Vida Hospital of Aberdeen, MS, LLC	d/b/a Merit Health River Region and Merit Health River Region West; Roh, LLC d/b/a Merit Health Women's Hospital; Tippah County Hospital; Alliance Healthcare System; Memorial Hospital at Gulfport; Delta Regional Medical Center; Progressive Medical Management of Batesville d/b/a Panola Medical Center; Boa Vida Hospital of Aberdeen, MS, LLC Nathan C. Grace, et al	

15-002289-9-0001-13000-71-75-FILED FOR 10/20/2015 08:58 AM IN EXHIBIT  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Injunction Pg 222 of 275



	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
525.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Estate	New York	The Estate of Justine Maria Aliotta; Aliotta, Joanne individually and as administratrix of the Estate of Justine Marie Aliotta, deceased; Torres Julissa Cecelia, an infant by her guardian Joanne Aliotta, on behalf of themselves and Plaintiff Class Consisting of all other persons in New York so situated	The Estate of Justine Maria Aliotta, et al. v. Purdue Pharma Inc., et al.	Sup. Ct. Richmond Cnty. 152057-2019
526.	Jonathan Sackler; Richard Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David Sackler	Estate	North Carolina	Leysen, Patty Carol, Administrator of the Estate of Brian Keith Johnston	Patty Carol Leysen, et al. vs. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corp., et al.	Sup. Ct. Davidson Cnty. 20-cvs-112
527.	Jonathan Sackler; Richard Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David Sackler	Estate	North Carolina	Stevens, Susan K., Administratrix of the Estate of Toria Capri Stevens	Susan Stevens, et al. v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corp., et al.	Sup. Ct. Forsyth Cnty. 20-cvs-352
528.	Beverly Sackler; David Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Jonathan Sackler; Kathe Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Richard Sackler; Theresa Sackler	Estate	North Carolina	Williams, Sonji B., Administratrix of the Estate of Tyler Michael Wain Williams	Sonji B. Williams, Administratrix of the Estate of Tyler Michael Wain Williams v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corp., et al.	Super. Ct. Gaston Cnty. 19-cvs-5192

19-02289-96111 Doc 1-19 Filed 04/14/20 Entered 04/14/20 15:08:58  
 Preliminary Injunction and Restraining Order Pg 224 of 275

	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
529.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Third Party Payor	Pennsylvania	AFSCME District Council 33 Health & Welfare Fund	AFSCME District Council 33 Health & Welfare Fund v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Philadelphia 180302269
530.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Third Party Payor	Pennsylvania	AFSCME District Council 47 Health & Welfare Fund	AFSCME District Council 47 Health & Welfare Fund v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Philadelphia 180302255
531.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Third Party Payor	Pennsylvania	Bricklayers and Allied Craftworkers Local Union No. 1 of PA/DE Health and Welfare Fund	Bricklayers and Allied Craftworkers Local Union No. 1 of PA/DE Health and Welfare Fund v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Philadelphia 180302256
532.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; Stuart D. Baker	Third Party Payor	Pennsylvania	Carpenters Health & Welfare Fund of Philadelphia & Vicinity	Carpenters Health & Welfare of Philadelphia & Vicinity v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	C.P. Philadelphia 180302264
533.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Estate	Pennsylvania	Davidson, Karen A., Individually, and Administratrix of the Estate of John C. Davidson, deceased	Karen Davidson, et al. v. Ignacio Badiola, M.D., et al.	C.P. Philadelphia Cnty. 200100381

Filed 11/03/20 Entered 11/03/20 17:50:58  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Antitrust  
 Pg 225 of 275







	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
				Laredo Texas Hospital Company, L.P. d/b/a Laredo Medical Center; San Angelo Hospital, L.P. d/b/a San Angelo Community Medical Center; Cedar Park Health System, L.P. d/b/a Cedar Park Regional Medical Center; NHCI of Hillsboro, Inc. d/b/a Hill Regional Hospital; Longview Medical Center, L.P. d/b/a Longview Regional Medical Center; Piney Woods Healthcare System, L.P. d/b/a Woodland Heights Medical Center	Woodland Heights Medical Center v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	
545.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.; Richard D. Sackler	Third Party Payor	Texas	Fire and Police Retirement Health Care Fund, San Antonio	Fire and Police Retirement Health Care Fund, San Antonio v. Richard D. Sackler, et al.	Harris Cnty. Dist. Ct. 2018-33724
546.	The Purdue Frederick Company; Richard Sackler; Beverly Sackler; David Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Jonathan Sackler; Kathe Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Theresa Sackler; John Stewart;	Hospital	West Virginia	West Virginia University Hospitals Inc.; Appalachian Regional Healthcare, Inc.; Bluefield Hospital Company, LLC; Broaddus Hospital Association; Camden-Clark Memorial Hospital	West Virginia University Hospitals Inc.; Appalachian Regional Healthcare, Inc.; Bluefield Hospital Company, LLC; Broaddus Hospital Association; Camden-Clark Memorial Hospital Corporation; Charleston Medical Center, Inc.; Charles Town General Hospital; City Hospital;	Civ. Action Nos. 19-C-69 through 19-C-88 and 19-C-134 through 19-C-139  Consolidated before MLP In re Opioid Litigation, Cir. Ct. Kanawha County 19-C-9000

19-02289-96111 Docket 7575 Filed 04/22/20 Entered 04/22/20 14:05:02 Page 229 of 275  
 Preliminary Injunction and Motion for Summary Judgment



	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
				Inc.; Webster County Memorial Hospital, Inc.; Wetzel County Hospital Association; Williamson Memorial Hospital, LLC.; Braxton County Memorial Hospital, Inc.		
<b><i>Estate, Individual, Third Party Payor (MDL)</i></b>						
547.	The Purdue Frederick Company, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.	NAS	MDL	A.M.H.	A.M.H., individually and next friend or guardian of minor Baby C.E., and on behalf of all others similarly situated v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Ohio 1:19-op-45052 Master Case No. 17-md- 2804

19-02289-99-0001 Filed 04/02/20 Entered 04/02/20 15:08:58 in Eastern District of Ohio  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Motion for Injunction Pg 231 of 275

	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
548.	The Purdue Frederick Company, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Phamaceuticals Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	NAS	MDL	Alexander, Melba	Melba Alexander, individually and as next friend and guardian of Baby B.H.R. v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Ohio 1:19-op-45502 Master Case No. 17-md-2804
549.	The Purdue Frederick Company, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Phamaceuticals Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	NAS	MDL	Ambrosio, Melissa	Melissa Ambrosio, individually and as next friend of Baby G.A., on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Ohio 1:18-op-45375 Master Case No. 17-md-2804

19-02289-96111  
 Preliminary Injunction  
 Docket 19-75111-10111  
 10/14/2020 10:20:20 AM  
 Pg 232 of 275

	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
550.	The Purdue Frederick Company, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Phamaceuticals Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	NAS	MDL	Artz, Jennifer	Jennifer Artz, individually and as next friend and guardian of Baby I.A.A., on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Ohio 1:19-op-45459 Master Case No. 17-md-2804
551.	The Purdue Frederick Company, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Phamaceuticals Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	NAS	MDL	Atkinson, Sandra	Sandra Atkinson, individually and as next friend and guardian of Baby L.C. v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Ohio 1:19-op-45531 Master Case No. 17-md-2804

19-02289-96111 Document 1-1 Filed 04/02/20 Entered 04/02/20 15:08:58  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Attachment Pg 233 of 275

	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
552.	The Purdue Frederick Company, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Phamaceuticals Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	NAS	MDL	Berzinski, April	April Berzinski, individually and as next friend and guardian of Baby A.Z. v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Ohio 1:19-op-45503 Master Case No. 17-md-2804
553.	The Purdue Frederick Company, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Phamaceuticals Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	NAS	MDL	Brant, Shelby L.	Shelby L. Brant, individually and as next friend and guardian of Baby L.A. and on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Ohio 1:19-op-45494 Master Case No. 17-md-2804

19-02289-0001 Docket 19-754 Preliminary Injunction and Joinder  
 Filed 04/02/20 Entered 04/02/20 15:08:58  
 Pg 234 of 275



	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
556.	The Purdue Frederick Company, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Phamaceuticals Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	NAS	MDL	Chancey, Musette	Musette Chancey, individually and as next friend and guardian of Babies D.C.1. and D.C.2. v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Ohio 1:19-op-45533 Master Case No. 17-md- 2804
557.	The Purdue Frederick Company, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Phamaceuticals Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	NAS	MDL	Cherry, Angela	Angela Cherry, individually and as next friend and guardian of Baby Z.C.1 on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Ohio 1:19-op-45490 Master Case No. 17-md- 2804
558.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Third Party Payor	MDL	Cleveland Bakers and Teamsters Health and Welfare Fund and Pipe Fitters Local Union No. 120 Insurance Fund	Cleveland Bakers and Teamsters Health and Welfare Fund and Pipe Fitters Local Union No. 120 Insurance Fund v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.,	N.D. Ohio 1:18-op-45432 Master Case No. 17-md- 2804

19-02289-0001 D004 19-07541-0001 MDL 4020/2018-04-04  
 Preliminary Injunction and Joinder  
 Filed 04/04/18 Page 296 of 275

















	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
576.	The Purdue Frederick Company, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Phamaceuticals Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	NAS	MDL	Goss, Heather	Heather Goss, individually and as next friend and guardian of Babies C.B. and V.B. v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Ohio 1:19-op-45518 Master Case No. 17-md- 2804
577.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	Wrongful Death	Mississippi	Greer, Julia	Julia Greer, individually and as next friend and on behalf of all wrongful death beneficiaries of Rose Greer, deceased v. Charles E. Greer, M.D., et al.	N.D. Ohio 1:19-op-46117 Master Case No. 17-md- 2804
578.	The Purdue Frederick Company, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Phamaceuticals Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	NAS	MDL	Hamawi, Marijha; Lara, Meghan	Marijha Hamawi, individually and as next friend and guardian of Babies K.L.H. and N.A.W.; and Meghan Lara, individually and as next friend and guardian of Babies K.L.H. and N.A.W., on behalf of themselves and all persons similarly situated v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Ohio 1:19-op-45477 Master Case No. 17-md- 2804

19-02289-96111 Doc 19 Filed 10/20/20 Page 245 of 275  
 Preliminary Injunction and Motion for Summary Judgment Pg 245 of 275













	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
591.	The Purdue Frederick Company, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Phamaceuticals Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	NAS	MDL	Lechuga, Niola	Niola Lechuga, individually and as next friend and guardian of Babies Q.H.L. and A.G.L., on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Ohio 1:19-op-45468 Master Case No. 17-md-2804
592.	The Purdue Frederick Company, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Phamaceuticals Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	NAS	MDL	Lively, Carol	Carol Lively, individually and as next friend and guardian of Baby L.L. v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Ohio 1:19-op-45523 Master Case No. 17-md-2804

19-02289-9611 DDD 19-02289-9611  
 Preliminary Injunction and Joinder  
 Filed 02/20/20 Entered 02/20/20 15:08:58  
 Pg 252 of 275















	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
607.	The Purdue Frederick Company, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Phamaceuticals Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	NAS	MDL	Paul, Chloe	Chloe Paul, individually and as next friend and guardian of Baby A.R.P., on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Ohio 1:19-op-45467 Master Case No. 17-md-2804
608.	The Purdue Frederick Company, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Phamaceuticals Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	NAS	MDL	Perkins, Jessica	Jessica Perkins, individually and as next friend and guardian of Babies P.A. and R.A. v. Purdue Pharm., et al.	N.D. Ohio 1:19-op-45535 Master Case No. 17-md-2804

19-02289-9611 D.D. 11/15/19  
 Preliminary Injunction and Appointment of Guardian  
 Pg 260 of 275

	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
609.	The Purdue Frederick Company, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Phamaceuticals Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	NAS	MDL	Peterson, Sally	Sally Peterson, individually and as next friend and guardian of Baby E.A.P., on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Ohio 1:19-op-45472 Master Case No. 17-md-2804
610.	The Purdue Frederick Company, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Phamaceuticals Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	NAS	MDL	Puckett, Heather	Heather Puckett, individually and as next friend and guardian of Baby C.M. on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Ohio 1:19-op-45539 Master Case No. 17-md-2804

19-02289-96111 Document 1-1 Filed 04/02/20 Entered 04/02/20 15:08:58  
 Preliminary Injunction and Motion for Joinder Pg 261 of 275

	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
611.	The Purdue Frederick Company, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Phamaceuticals Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	NAS	MDL	Rees, Deric; Rees, Ceonda	Deric Rees and Ceonda Rees, individually and as next friend and guardian of baby T.W.B. on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated v. McKesson Corp., et al.	N.D. Ohio 1:18-op-45252 Master Case No. 17-md- 2804
612.	The Purdue Frederick Company, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Phamaceuticals Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	NAS	MDL	Richardson, Waikeisha	Waikeisha Richardson, individually and as next friend and guardian of the E.M.1. and E.M.2. v. the Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Ohio 1:19-op-45538 Master Case No. 17-md- 2804
613.	The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.	NAS	MDL	Riling, Andrew G.; Riling, Beverly	Andrew G. Riling and Beverly Riling, as next friends of A.P. Riling, minor under the age of Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Ohio 1:19-op-45056 Master Case No. 17-md- 2804

19-02289-96111 DocId:32751111 Filed 04/02/20 Entered 04/02/20 15:08:58 in Exhibit  
 Preliminary Injunction and/or Appointment of Guardian  
 Page 262 of 275









	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
623.	The Purdue Frederick Company, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Phamaceuticals Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	NAS	MDL	Stewart, Wendy	Wendy Stewart, individually and as next friend and guardian of Baby K.J.C., on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Ohio 1:19-op-45481 Master Case No. 17-md-2804
624.	The Purdue Frederick Company, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Phamaceuticals Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	NAS	MDL	Taylor, Jessica	Jessica Taylor, individually and as next friend and guardian of Baby D.S. v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Ohio 1:19-op-45528 Master Case No. 17-md-2804

19-02289-96111 Document 1-1 Filed 04/02/20 Entered 04/02/20 15:08:58  
 Preliminary Injunction and Contempt Pg 267 of 275

	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
625.	The Purdue Frederick Company, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Phamaceuticals Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	NAS	MDL	Taylor, Lori	Lori Taylor, individually and as next friend and guardian of Baby M.T. v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Ohio 1:19-op-45529 Master Case No. 17-md-2804
626.	The Purdue Frederick Company, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Phamaceuticals Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	NAS	MDL	Thomas, Jennifer	Jennifer Thomas, individually and as next friend and guardian of Baby A.S. v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Ohio 1:19-op-45542 Master Case No. 17-md-2804

19-02289-96111 Document 1-1 Filed 04/02/20 Entered 04/02/20 15:08:58  
 Preliminary Injunction and Motion for Injunction Pg 268 of 275





	<b>Related Parties</b>	<b>Action Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)</b>	<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Court/Case Number</b>
632.	The Purdue Frederick Company, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Phamaceuticals Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	NAS	MDL	Warren, Desirae	Desirae Warren, individually and as next friend and guardian of Baby A.W., on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Ohio 1:19-op-45486 Master Case No. 17-md-2804
633.	The Purdue Frederick Company, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Phamaceuticals Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	NAS	MDL	Watson, Paula	Paula Watson, individually and as next friend and guardian of Baby D.M. v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Ohio 1:19-op-45545 Master Case No. 17-md-2804

19-02289-96111 Document 15-1 Filed 04/02/20 Entered 04/02/20 15:08:58  
 Preliminary Injunction and Motion for Joinder Pg 271 of 275



	Related Parties	Action Type	State	Underlying Plaintiff(s) (Last, First)	Case Caption	Court/Case Number
636.	The Purdue Frederick Company, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Phamaceuticals Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	NAS	MDL	Whittaker, Shelley	Shelley Whittaker, individually and as next friend and guardian of Babies E.W., G.L.O., and N.S.G., on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Ohio 1:19-op-45475 Master Case No. 17-md-2804
637.	The Purdue Frederick Company, Inc.; Rhodes Technologies Inc.; Rhodes Phamaceuticals Inc.; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Richard S. Sackler; Jonathan D. Sackler; Mortimer D.A. Sackler; Kathe A. Sackler; Ilene Sackler Lefcourt; Beverly Sackler; Theresa Sackler; David A. Sackler; Trust for the Benefit of Members of the Raymond Sackler Family	NAS	MDL	Whittington, Katherine	Katherine Whittington, individually and as next friend and guardian of Babies S.W. and A.W. v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	N.D. Ohio 1:19-op-45541 Master Case No. 17-md-2804

19-08289-9-01-11  
 Preliminary Injunction and Joinder  
 Filed 11/17/19  
 11/17/19 11:50:58 AM  
 Pg 273 of 275





# **EXHIBIT 2**

# **MONITOR AGREEMENT**

## **Purdue Monitor Agreement**

This monitor agreement (the “Agreement”) dated as February \_\_, 2020 (“Effective Date”), is entered into between Tom Vilsack (“Monitor”) and Purdue Pharma L.P. (“PPLP”).

### **Recitals**

WHEREAS, on September 15, 2019, PPLP and its direct and indirect subsidiaries and general partner (collectively, the “Debtors” or “Purdue”) each commenced a voluntary case under chapter 11 of title 11 of the United States Code (the “Bankruptcy Code”) in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York (the “Bankruptcy Court”), which cases are being jointly administered under Case No. 19-23649 (the “Chapter 11 Cases”);

WHEREAS, on October 11, 2019, the Bankruptcy Court entered the *Order Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 105(a) Granting, in Part, Motion for a Preliminary Injunction* [ECF No. 82] in a related adversary proceeding, Adv. Pro. No. 19-08289 (the “Adversary Proceeding”), pursuant to which the Debtors are subject to the Voluntary Injunction (as modified by: *Amended Order Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 105(a) Granting, in Part, Motion for a Preliminary Injunction* [ECF No. 89], *Second Amended Order Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 105(a) Granting Motion for a Preliminary Injunction* [ECF No. 105], *Third Amended Order Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 105(a) Granting Motion for a Preliminary Injunction* [ECF No. 115], *Fourth Amended Order Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 105(a) Granting Motion for a Preliminary Injunction* [ECF No. 126], *Fifth Amended Order Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 105(a) Granting Motion for a Preliminary Injunction* [ECF No. 132], *Sixth Amended Order Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 105(a) Granting Motion for a Preliminary Injunction* [ECF No. 139], and any subsequent orders of the Bankruptcy Court, each of which shall automatically be deemed part of this Agreement upon entry of such order by the Bankruptcy Court. collectively referred to as, the “Voluntary Injunction”), each of which can be found by the references identified in Appendix 1 attached hereto; and

WHEREAS, the Voluntary Injunction provides that the Debtors shall work expeditiously to retain a Monitor on the terms set forth in the Voluntary Injunction.

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual covenants contained herein, the parties agree as follows:

### **Agreement**

**Appointment and Term of Monitor.** Purdue hereby appoints the Monitor to undertake those duties and responsibilities of the Monitor set forth in the Voluntary Injunction and as may hereafter be ordered by the Bankruptcy Court. All terms in this Agreement are to be interpreted in a manner consistent with the Voluntary Injunction.

The term of the Monitor shall begin on the date that this Agreement is executed by the Monitor and Purdue and shall continue until the close of the Chapter 11 Cases or such other time as the Bankruptcy Court may hereafter order.

The Monitor may terminate his appointment under this Agreement, without cause, no earlier than ninety (90) days after the receipt of written notice of termination by Purdue's General Counsel.

**Rights, Powers and Responsibilities of the Monitor.** The Monitor shall have all of the rights, powers and responsibilities set forth in Section II.H of the Voluntary Injunction as well as any other rights, powers and responsibilities as may hereafter be ordered by the Bankruptcy Court. The Monitor acknowledges and agrees that he will abide by the terms of the Voluntary Injunction as of the Effective Date, and acknowledges and agrees that any subsequent orders entered by the Bankruptcy Court relating to the Voluntary Injunction will be incorporated herein upon entry, and that the Monitor will then have all of the rights, powers, and responsibilities set forth in the Voluntary Injunction as amended by any such subsequent order.

**Agreements of Purdue.** Purdue agrees to fully, completely and promptly cooperate with the Monitor as set forth in the Voluntary Injunction. Such cooperation shall include instructing and encouraging each of its officers, directors, employees, professional advisors and consultants to carry out such acts as are necessary for the company to fulfill its agreement to cooperate.

**Monitor Compensation and Costs.** The Monitor shall serve without bond or other security and shall be compensated by Purdue for work on this engagement at a rate of [redacted] per hour. In addition, Purdue shall pay all reasonable out of pocket expenses reasonably incurred by the Monitor in performance of the engagement. The Monitor will submit receipts and any other back-up documentation reasonably requested by Purdue ("Expense Documentation") for any expenses for which the Monitor seeks reimbursement hereunder, and the Monitor agrees Purdue shall not be liable for any expenses for which there is no adequate Expense Documentation. Purdue will pay the Monitor within forty-five (45) days of its receipt of a correct, undisputed invoice, provided that the Monitor's compensation is subject to final approval by the Bankruptcy Court.

**Other Consultants.** The Monitor shall have the authority to employ, upon Purdue's prior written consent, such consent not to be unreasonably withheld, delayed or conditioned, and upon the Bankruptcy Court's approval, such consultants as may be necessary to carry out his responsibilities, at Purdue's cost and expense. Requests to employ consultants should be directed to Purdue's General Counsel, and will be decided upon no later than ten (10) days from their receipt. The Monitor will work in good faith with Purdue to ensure such approved consultants will follow Purdue's policies and procedures with respect to any payments remitted directly by Purdue.

**Miscellaneous.**

**Standard of Performance; Representations.** The Monitor will conduct business in accordance with all applicable (i) ethical code requirements, (ii) regulatory requirements, (iii) government-issued rules and guidance, including those relating to data privacy and security, and (iv) all applicable federal, state and local laws, regulations and orders. The Monitor represents and covenants that the Monitor is, and during the term of this Agreement will remain, in compliance with all applicable federal, state and local laws, regulations and orders.

Conflict of Interest. In the event the Monitor becomes aware that he, or any consultants working under this Agreement, has or may have a conflict of interest that may affect, or could have the appearance of affecting, the Monitor or persons working with the Monitor from performing any of the duties under this Agreement, the Monitor shall promptly inform Purdue. If the Monitor or a consultant works for, or provides services to, the federal government, whether as a full-time or part-time federal government employee or a special federal government employee or consultant, the Monitor represents by signing this Agreement that no real or apparent conflict of interest exists by entering into this Agreement with Purdue. Except for disclosures expressly contemplated herein, the Monitor represents and warrants that he is not required to give any notice or obtain any consent from any person or entity in connection with the execution and delivery of this Agreement.

Confidentiality. The Monitor agrees that he will promptly sign the governing Protective Order entered by the Bankruptcy Court, and that he will cause any approved consultants to sign the Protective Order, and that he and any consultants hereinafter retained will be subject to the terms of the Protective Order and any confidentiality orders that are consistent with the Protective Order.

Choice of Law. This Agreement is governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of New York (without giving effect to the principles thereof relating to conflicts of law) applicable to contracts negotiated, executed and performed entirely.

Waiver amendment modification. This Agreement sets forth all terms of engagement between the Monitor and Purdue. No waiver, amendment or other modification of this Agreement shall be effective unless in writing and signed by each party to be bound thereby.

Independent Contractor. The Monitor is an independent contractor and not an agent, employee, joint venturer or partner of Purdue for income tax purposes or otherwise. No life, casualty, or disability insurance, workers' compensation, or health, retirement or any other employment benefits shall be paid by Purdue to or for the benefit of the Monitor.

Counterparts. This Agreement may be executed in counterparts each of which shall be considered effective as an original signature.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have executed this Agreement as of the Effective Date.

BY:

**PURDUE PHARMA L.P.**

**MONITOR**

\_\_\_\_\_  
MARC L. KESSELMAN  
Senior Vice President,  
General Counsel & Corporate Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
TOM VILSACK

**Appendix I**

*Order Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 105(a) Granting, in Part, Motion for a Preliminary Injunction*  
[ECF No. 82]

*Amended Order Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 105(a) Granting, in Part, Motion for a Preliminary Injunction* [ECF No. 89]

*Second Amended Order Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 105(a) Granting Motion for a Preliminary Injunction* [ECF No. 105]

*Third Amended Order Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 105(a) Granting Motion for a Preliminary Injunction* [ECF No. 115]

*Fourth Amended Order Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 105(a) Granting Motion for a Preliminary Injunction* [ECF No. 126]

*Fifth Amended Order Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 105(a) Granting Motion for a Preliminary Injunction* [ECF No. 132]

*Sixth Amended Order Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 105(a) Granting Motion for a Preliminary Injunction* [ECF No. 139]

*Seventh Amended Order Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 105(a) Granting Motion for a Preliminary Injunction* [ECF No. 145]

*Eighth Amended Order Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 105(a) Granting Motion for a Preliminary Injunction* [ECF No. 168]

*Ninth Amended Order Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 105(a) Granting Motion for a Preliminary Injunction* [ECF No. 175]

## **EXHIBIT 3**

# **LIST OF DOCUMENTS AND MATERIALS RECEIVED FROM PURDUE PHARMA AND RELATED ENTITIES FEBRUARY 13, 2020**

**LIST OF DOCUMENTS AND MATERIALS RECEIVED FROM PURDUE  
PHARMA AND RELATED ENTITIES FEBRUARY 13, 2020**

Purdue Monitoring Agreement  
Protective Order Filed January 28, 2020 - Document 784  
Company Overview Materials  
Company Background Documents  
Voluntary Injunction training materials  
Company Policies and Standard Operating Procedures  
OxyContin Package Insert and Medication Guide  
CDC Guideline for Prescribing Opioids for Chronic Pain  
FDA Guidance on Advertising and Promotion  
FDA Guidance on Unsolicited Requests  
FDA Guidance on Communications with Payors

# **EXHIBIT 4**

## **PURDUE PHARMA DOCUMENTS PRODUCED MARCH 4 AND 8, 2020**

**PURDUE PHARMA DOCUMENTS PRODUCED MARCH 4 AND 8, 2020**

Federal and State Aggregate Spend Reports  
Company Policies and Reports  
Company Standard Operating Procedures  
List of Research and Development Studies  
Product Catalogue

# **EXHIBIT 5**

## **PURDUE PHARMA DOCUMENTS DELIVERED MARCH 19 AND 20, 2020**

**PURDUE PHARMA DOCUMENTS DELIVERED MARCH 19 AND 20, 2020**

Medical Inquiry Logs

Suspicious Ordering Monitoring documents

Federal Aggregate Spend Reports

Industry Alerts

# **EXHIBIT 6**

## **PURDUE PHARMA DOCUMENTS DELIVERED MARCH 23, 2020**

**PURDUE PHARMA DOCUMENTS DELIVERED MARCH 23, 2020**

Suspicious Order Monitoring Documents

# **EXHIBIT 7**

**PURDUE PHARMA PRODUCED  
APRIL 13, 2020**

**PURDUE PHARMA PRODUCED APRIL 13, 2020**

Financial Records  
FDA Submissions and Communications  
Lobbying Agreements

# **EXHIBIT 8**

## **PURDUE DOCUMENTS PRODUCED APRIL 20, 21, 29, AND 30, 2020**

**PURDUE DOCUMENTS PRODUCED APRIL 20, 21, 29, AND 30, 2020**

FDA Communications  
Federal Aggregate Spend Reports  
Lobbying Agreements  
Lobbying Communications  
Lobbying Disclosure Forms  
Draft Scientific Publications

## **EXHIBIT 9**

# **DOCUMENTS RECEIVED FROM PURDUE PHARMA – MAY 11, 2020**

**PURDUE DOCUMENTS PRODUCED MAY 11, 2020**

Lobbying Reports

Lobbying Agreement